arXiv:1701.04299v1 [quant-ph] 16 Jan 2017

Multi-qubit Randomized Benchmarking Using Few Samples

Jonas Helsen,[1] Joel J. Wallman,[2,3] Steven T. Flammia,[4,5] and Stephanie Wehner[1]

[1] *QuTech, Delft University of Technology, Lorentzweg 1, 2628 CJ Delft, The Netherlands*
[2] *Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1, Canada*
[3] *Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1, Canada*
[4] *Centre for Engineered Quantum Systems, School of Physics, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia*
[5] *Center for Theoretical Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA*

(Dated: January 17, 2017)

Randomized benchmarking (RB) is an efficient and robust method to characterize gate errors in quantum circuits. Averaging over random sequences of gates leads to estimates of gate errors in terms of the average fidelity that are isolated from the state preparation and measurement errors that plague other methods like channel tomography and direct fidelity estimation. A decisive factor in the feasibility of randomized benchmarking is the number of samples required to obtain rigorous confidence intervals. Previous bounds were either prohibitively loose or required the number of sampled sequences to scale exponentially with the number of qubits in order to obtain a fixed confidence interval at a fixed error rate.

Here we show that the number of sampled sequences required for a fixed confidence interval is dramatically smaller than could previously be justified. In particular, we show that the number of sampled sequences required is essentially independent of the number of qubits. We also show that the number of samples required with a single qubit is substantially smaller than previous rigorous results, especially in the limit of large sequence lengths. Our results bring rigorous randomized benchmarking on systems with many qubits into the realm of experimental feasibility.

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the central problems in the creation of large scale, functioning, quantum computers is the need to accurately and efficiently diagnose the strength and character of the various types of noise that arise in implementations. This noise can be due to many factors, such as imperfect manufacturing, suboptimal calibration, or uncontrolled coupling to the external world. A variety of tools have been developed to diagnose such noise, including state and channel tomography [7, 34], direct fidelity estimation (DFE) [16], gate set tomography [5, 31], and randomized benchmarking (RB) [13, 27, 29]. All of these tools have different strengths and weaknesses. State and channel tomography allow the user to get a full characterization of the quantum state or channel of interest subject to state preparation and measurement errors (SPAM), which place a noise floor on the accuracy of these characterizations. These protocols require resources that scale exponentially with the number of qubits, making them prohibitively expensive for use in multi-qubit systems. Gate set tomography remedies the SPAM issue, but requires even more resources. In contrast, protocols like DFE and RB do not aspire to a full characterization of the system, but instead aim to efficiently estimate a single figure of merit that ideally captures the most relevant properties of the system under investigation. The figure of merit estimated by DFE and RB is the average fidelity to some target state or gate. Furthermore, RB is also robust to SPAM errors. This makes RB the protocol of choice for characterizing many candidate quantum computing platforms [2, 3, 10, 18, 27]. Variants of RB that estimate output purity [42], and state leakage [41, 43] have also been devised.

An important practical problem when using RB is choosing a number of random gate sequences that is sufficiently small to be practical experimentally, and yet gives a good estimate of the gate fidelity. This problem becomes increasingly relevant as error rates improve since estimating small errors accurately typically requires more samples. Early treatments of this problem demanded numbers of sequences that were orders of magnitude larger than were feasible in experiment [30]. A more specialized analysis allowed rigorous confidence intervals to be derived for a number of random sequences comparable to experiments [40]. However, this analysis was only valid for short sequence lengths, and only provided reasonable bounds for a single qubit while more general multi-qubit bounds had an unfavorable exponential scaling with the number

of qubits being benchmarked. The restriction to short sequence lengths is also problematic because long sequences generally lead to better experimental fits [14].

In this paper we prove a bound on the number of sequences required, when performing RB on the set of Clifford gates, to obtain rigorous confidence intervals that is several orders of magnitude sharper than previous multi-qubit bounds, and makes rigorous and efficient characterization of multi-qubit systems possible using a reasonable amount of experimental resources. In particular, our bounds are approximately independent of the number of qubits being benchmarked, an exponential improvement over previous non-trivial multi-qubit bounds. As a special case, we also obtain bounds for the single-qubit version of RB that are valid for all sequence lengths and improve on the bounds of Ref. [40] for long sequence lengths. The key to the analysis of the statistical performance is a novel understanding of the representations of the Clifford group, developed in a companion paper [23]. We also prove that, in some sense, the derived bounds are optimal.

Outline: In section II we present an overview of the new contributions of this paper (equations of note here are eqs. (10), (12) and (13)) and explain their context. In section III, we discuss the implications of the new bound for experiments, and investigate it in various limits. Finally, in section IV we discuss the derivation of the new bounds and how to apply them in practice. We also prove that our results are optimal in some well specified sense. We focus on intuition and displace most of the technical proofs to the Supplementary Material. We make heavy use of techniques from group and representation theory, which are of independent interest, but were derived in a more general setting than needed for the purpose of this paper. Readers interested in the details of this part of the derivation are invited to the companion paper [23].

Figure of merit

We begin by introducing the essential quantities we will use to state and derive our results. The central problem that RB addresses is how to efficiently obtain a rigorous figure of merit quantifying how close a physically-performed operation $\hat{U}$ is to the ideal target operation U, which is generally taken to be unitary. We can always write $\hat{U}$ as the composition of the ideal operation U with some noise process Λ, i.e. $\hat{U} = \Lambda \circ U$, where Λ is a completely positive, trace preserving (CPTP) map [7]. The quality of a noisy implementation $\hat{U}$ relative to its ideal implementation U is typically quantified by the average (gate) fidelity,

$$F_{avg}(U, \hat{U}) = \int \mathrm{d}\phi F(U(\phi), \hat{U}(\phi)), \tag{1}$$

where $\mathrm{d}\phi$ is the uniform Haar measure over pure quantum states. For unitaries U, this can be reduced to

$$F_{avg}(U, \hat{U}) = \int \mathrm{d}\phi F(U(\phi), \hat{U}(\phi)) = \int \mathrm{d}\phi \langle\phi|\Lambda(\phi)|\phi\rangle = F_{avg}(\Lambda, \mathbb{1}), \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ is the identity operation. This quantity is equivalent to the entanglement fidelity of Λ [33], which quantifies how well Λ preserves entanglement when acting on half of an entangled state. Another useful quantity is the average infidelity r defined as

$$r(\Lambda) = 1 - F_{avg}(\Lambda, \mathbb{1}) \tag{3}$$

We also use the quantity $f = f(\Lambda)$ defined as

$$f(\Lambda) = \frac{dF_{avg}(\Lambda) - 1}{d - 1} \tag{4}$$

One can think of f as the "depolarizing parameter" associated to the channel Λ. It is this quantity which randomized benchmarking can estimate. In the text, we will often drop the channel Λ from the (in)fidelity and depolarizing parameter and simply write $r(\Lambda) = r$ when it is clear from the context which channel is

being used.

We also use the unitarity of the channel Λ [42], given by:

$$\chi(\Lambda) = \chi = \frac{d}{d-1} \int d\phi \, \mathrm{Tr}\left[\Lambda(\phi - \mathbb{1}_d/d)^2\right], \tag{5}$$

which lies in the interval $[0, 1]$ and is 1 if and only if Λ is unitary. The unitarity can be efficiently estimated using a procedure related to randomized benchmarking [42]. Having an a priori estimate for $\chi(\Lambda)$ generally allows fewer sequences to be sampled in RB, but we can prove that the number of needed sequences is reasonable even without a prior bound on the unitarity.

The randomized benchmarking protocol

In the box below we lay out the randomized benchmarking protocol as it was analyzed in [27, 30, 40]. We will perform randomized benchmarking over the Clifford group on q qubits $\mathcal{C}$. This is the group of unitary operations that can be constructed by considering all possible concatenations of CNOT gates, Hadamard gates and $\pi/4$ phase gates on the q qubits [20]. Note that in contrast to earlier protocols we do not assume the ideal measurement operator to be the projector on the $|0 \cdots 0\rangle$ state. Instead we perform some stabilizer measurement related to a pre-chosen Pauli matrix P. We pick the input state to be some (noisy) state ρ with support on the positive eigenspace of the Pauli operator P. Ideally we would like to to prepare the noisy state $\rho \equiv \frac{\mathbb{1}+P}{d}$, but as we explain in section IV this is not a necessity for rigorous randomized benchmarking.

As seen in Figure 1 randomized benchmarking, for a given sequence of Clifford operations $\vec{G}$ of length m computes the survival probability $p_m(\vec{G})$. The average of this survival probability $p_m(\vec{G})$ over all possible Clifford strings of length m yields a number p_m which can be related to the average fidelity $F_{avg}(\Lambda)$ by fitting p_m for various values m to the decay curve

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|^m} \sum_{\vec{G} \in \mathcal{C}^m} p_m(\vec{G}) = p_m = A f(\Lambda)^m + B, \tag{6}$$

where $f(\Lambda)$ is the channel depolarizing parameter related to the average fidelity of the channel Λ as in eq. (4) and A and B are fitting parameters which do not depend on the quantum channel Λ. In practice the number of possible sequences for a given m is too large to average over completely. Instead one averages over a subset of sequences, which generates an empirical estimate $P_{m,N}$ whose validity we interpret using *confidence regions*. A confidence region, for some set confidence level $1-\delta$ and size ϵ, is an interval $[P_{m,N} - \epsilon, P_{m,N} + \epsilon]$ around the estimate $P_{m,N}$ such that the probability that the (unknown) parameter p_m lies in this interval with probability greater than $1 - \delta$, i.e.,

$$\mathrm{Prob}\left[p_m(\Lambda) \in [P_{m,N} - \epsilon, P_{m,N} + \epsilon]\right] \geq 1 - \delta. \tag{7}$$

These confidence intervals, obtained for various values of sequence length during the experiment can then be used in the fitting procedure eq. (6) to generate a confidence interval around the empirical estimate $\hat{F}$ for the true channel average fidelity $F_{avg}(\Lambda)$. This can be done using standard statistical procedures (see e.g. [4]). The number of random sequences N used to obtain $P_{m,N}$ will depend on ϵ and δ which are set before the beginning of the experiment, and in general also on some prior estimate of the infidelity r. The rest of the paper will be concerned with making this N as small as possible given δ and ϵ and (if possible) an a priori bound on the average infidelity r.

II. RESULTS

In this section we state the main contributions of the paper. We present practical bounds on the number of sequences required to obtain rigorous confidence intervals for randomized benchmarking under the

1. Choose a random sequence $\vec{G} = (G_1, \ldots, G_m)$ of m gates independently and uniformly at random from the q-qubit Clifford group $\mathcal{C}$.
2. Prepare q qubits in a state ρ that maximizes $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho P)$ [e.g., $\rho \approx 2^{-q}(1 + P)$].
3. For $t = 0, \ldots, m$, apply the compiled gate $G_{t+1}G_t^\dagger$, where $G_0 = G_{m+1} = 1$.
4. Measure the expectation value $p_m(\vec{G})$ of some operator $Q \approx P$ to a suitable precision (By repeating 1-3 for the same sequence K times)
5. Repeat steps 1–5 a total of N times to estimate

$$\mathbb{E}_{\vec{G}}(P_m) = |\mathcal{C}|^{-m} \sum_{\vec{G} \in \mathcal{C}_q^m} p_m(\vec{G})$$

to a suitable precision (implicitly regarding the $p_m(\vec{G})$ as realizations of a random variable P_m). We call the empirical average over the N sampled Clifford sequences $P_{m,N}$
6. Repeat steps 1–6 for multiple values of m and fit to the decay model

$$\mathbb{E}_{\vec{G}}(P_m) = Af^m + B,$$

where $f = (dF_{avg} - 1)/d - 1$ with $d = 2^q$ [29].

FIG. 1. **The Randomized Benchmarking Protocol.** We perform randomized benchmarking using the Clifford group $\mathcal{C}$, i.e. all gates that can be constructed by successive application of CNOT gates, Hadamard gates and $\pi/4$ phase gates. We assume the input state ρ to be a noisy implementation of the state $2^{-q}(1 + P)$, and Q an noisy implementation of P. We denote the length of an RB sequence by m, the amount of random sequences for a given m by N and the amount of times a single sequence is repeated by K. The goal of this paper is to provide confidence intervals around the empirical average $P_{m,N}$ assuming that individual realizations $P_m(\vec{G})$ can be estimated to arbitrary precision (corresponding to the case $K \to \infty$). In experimental implementations, running the same sequence many times (K) is typically easy, but running many different sequences (N) is hard [14], meaning that the quantity that we want to minimize is N. See section IV for a detailed discussion of the construction of confidence regions around the empirical average $P_{m,N}$

assumption that the expectation values $p_m(\vec{G})$ for a given Clifford sequence $\vec{G}$ can be estimated easily to a very high precision [14, 40]. In order to construct a $1 - \delta$ confidence interval of size ϵ around a randomized benchmarking sequence average $p_{m,N}$ with sequence length m, system dimension d and a prior estimate of the channel infidelity r and (optionally) a prior on the channel unitarity χ one needs to average over N random sequences where N is given by

$$N(\delta, \epsilon, m, r, \chi, d) = -\log(2/\delta) \left[\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\right) \frac{1-\epsilon}{\mathbb{V}^2 + 1} + \log\left(\frac{\mathbb{V}^2}{\mathbb{V}^2 + \epsilon}\right) \frac{\mathbb{V}^2 + \epsilon}{\mathbb{V}^2 + 1} \right]^{-1}, \tag{8}$$

where $\mathbb{V}^2$ is the variance of the distribution of the samples $p_m(\vec{G})$ from a uniform distribution over the Clifford sequences $\vec{G}$. This variance is given for the case of single and multi-qubit systems below.

Single-qubit randomized benchmarking

For single-qubit randomized benchmarking, we can derive the upper bound

$$\mathbb{V}_m^2 \leq 6 \left(\frac{1-\chi^m}{1-\chi}\right) r^2 + \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2}\right) r^2 + \eta \frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2} r, \tag{9}$$

on the variance $\mathbb{V}$ in terms of the infidelity r,the unitarity χ, the depolarizing factor $f = 1 - \frac{dr}{d-1}$ and where η is a (usually small) prefactor solely dependent on SPAM. This bound outperforms the rigorous bounds

for RB of Ref. [40] in that it is valid for all sequence lengths. This bound involves the unitarity χ but in the limit of large and small sequence lengths m we can make approximations which are independent of the unitarity. For small sequence lengths,

$$\mathbb{V}_m^2 \leq \frac{13}{2} m r^2 + 2\eta m r, \tag{10}$$

while for large sequence lengths,

$$\mathbb{V}_m^2 \leq \frac{7}{2} r + \eta. \tag{11}$$

These bounds are valid for all sequence lengths, although they will generally be loose outside of the appropriate limit.

To illustrate the improvements due to our bound, consider an RB experiment with sequences of length $m = 100$ and average infidelity $r \leq 10^{-4}$. To obtain a rigorous 99% confidence interval of size $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$ around $p_{m,N}$, Ref. [40] reported that $N = 145$ random sequences were needed (for $\eta = 0$). By contrast, our bounds imply that $N = 86$ random sequences are sufficient. Furthermore, the new bound has substantially better scaling with m (i.e., linear rather than quadratic for small m and independent of m for large m). For instance, with $m = 5000$ and all other parameters as above, our bound only requires $N = 221$ compared to the $N = 26762$ required by the bound of Ref. [40].



(a) Plot of the scaling with system size for eq. (15) and previous bounds [40].

(b) Plot showing scaling with sequence length for new (eqs. (10) and (11)) and previous [40] bounds

FIG. 2. **Improvements in dimensional and sequence length scaling** The number of sequences needed (on a log scale) to obtain a 99% confidence interval around $p_{m,N}$ with $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$ for a prior infidelity $r = 10^{-3}$ as a function of (a) the number of qubits from eq. (15) (full line), and (b) the sequence length m for a single qubit from min{eq. (10),eq. (11)} (full line) compared to the bounds from [40] (dashed lines). In both cases, our bounds are asymptotically constant while the old bounds diverge. For multiple qubits, we set the SPAM contribution to $\eta + \hat{\eta} = 0.05$ while for single qubits we set the SPAM contribution to $\eta = 0$ in both bounds.

Multi-qubit randomized benchmarking

The most important contribution of this paper is a bound on the number of sequences N needed for multi-qubit randomized benchmarking. Previous bounds for multi-qubit RB [30, 40] are either prohibitively loose or scale exponentially with the number of qubits. Our new bound resolves both these issues using techniques from representation theory, enabling multi-qubit RB with practical numbers of random sequences.

Bound for noiseless multi-qubit RB

For states and measurements that are (very close to) ideal,

$$\mathbb{V}_0^2 \leq 2\left(\frac{1-\chi^m}{1-\chi}\right)\frac{d+1}{d-1}r^2 + \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2}\right)\left(\frac{d^2-2}{(d-1)^2}\right)r^2. \tag{12}$$

This bound scales quadratically in the infidelity r and is asymptotically independent of system size d, but again involves the unitarity. In the limit of small sequence lengths m we have

$$\mathbb{V}_0^2 \leq \left(2\frac{d+1}{d-1} + \frac{d^2-2}{4(d-1)^2}\right)mr^2, \tag{13}$$

which is independent of the unitarity.

Bounds including SPAM noise for multi-qubit RB

As in the qubit case our bounds are sensitive to SPAM errors, which introduce terms into the variance which scale linearly in the infidelity r. For the case of multiple qubit two different SPAM contributions appear. In theorem 2 of the Supplementary Material, we prove that in the presence of SPAM errors the variance is bounded by

$$\mathbb{V}_{\mathrm{SPAM}}^2 \leq \mathbb{V}_0^2 + \left(\frac{d\hat{\eta}}{d-1}\left(\frac{1-f^m}{1-f}\right) + \frac{d\eta}{d-1}\frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2}\right)r, \tag{14}$$

with $\mathbb{V}_0^2$ the variance from eq. (12). The correction factors η and $\hat{\eta}$ only depend on SPAM (see eq. (37)). As we show in section IV this SPAM dependence is impossible to avoid if one wants to retain the preferred quadratic scaling in infidelity r. This bound is also asymptotically independent of the number of qubits. This means we can perform rigorous randomized benchmarking even in the limit of very many qubits. This improvement will become increasingly relevant as quantum systems are scaled up to larger sizes and lower noise rates. We illustrate the difference in scaling with respect to system size in fig. 2.

In the limit of small sequence lengths the variance bound in the presence of SPAM also has a unitarity free approximation:

$$\mathbb{V}_{\mathrm{SPAM}}^2 \leq \left(2\frac{d+1}{d-1} + \frac{d^2-2}{(d-1)^2}\right)mr^2 + \frac{d}{d-1}\left(\eta+\hat{\eta}\right)mr. \tag{15}$$

An important difference between the variance in the qubit case and the multi-qubit case is the appearance of a second SPAM term (proportional to $\hat{\eta}$). Due to the nature of the Clifford group on a single qubit this prefactor does not show up in the single qubit case (see section IV).

To illustrate the improvements our methods yield we can again compare to [40]. Consider a system with 4 qubits, that is, $d = 16$, with sequence length $m = 100$, an a priori estimate of $r \leq 10^{-3}$, and $\eta = \hat{\eta} = 0.05$. For a 99% confidence region of size $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$ the previous best known bound for multiple qubits [40] would require $N = 3 \times 10^5$ random sequences, while our dimensionally-independent bound from eq. (15) only requires $N = 200$.

Optimality of results

We also prove (see section IV) that for *arbitrary* SPAM a bound on the variance which is linear in the infidelity r is in fact optimal. This means the result stated above is in some sense the best possible bound on the variance of a randomized benchmarking sequence. To prove this we introduce the concept of *symmetrized* randomized benchmarking.

III. DISCUSSION

In this section we explore in depth the effect of the bounds in eqs. (9) to (15) on the number of random sequences needed to perform rigorous randomized benchmarking in different parameter regimes.

Scaling with number of qubits.

We begin by discussing the effect of the number of qubits in the system on the variance and the number of necessary sequences.

As illustrated in fig. 2 and can be seen from eq. (12), the derived bound is almost independent of the number of qubits q (where $d = 2^q$). In fact, the bound on the variance decreases asymptotically to a constant in the limit of many qubits despite the number of possible sequences (that is, $|\mathcal{C}_q|^m$) increasing exponentially with the number of qubits. This behavior matches previous loose bounds [30], but constitutes an exponential improvement over previous bounds in which the variance scaled exponentially with the number of qubits [40].

To further illustrate the behavior of the bound, fig. 3 shows the number of sequences needed for a 99% confidence interval around $p_{m,N}$ of size $2r$ versus the number of qubits in the system for various values of r ranging from 10^{-2} to $10^{-4}$and sequence length $m = 100$. The size of ϵ was chosen to reflect that for fixed sequence length a smaller infidelity will lead to the need for greater precision around $p_{m.N}$ for a successful fit to the exponential eq. (6) [14]. This plot was made using the unitarity-independent bound in eq. (13) for ideal SPAM, but similar plots can be made for non-negligible SPAM errors using eq. (14). Note also the scaling of of the bound with the fidelity. We will discuss this in the next section.



FIG. 3. **Number of sequences needed vs system size for various infidelities.** Number of sequences needed for a 99% confidence interval of size $\epsilon = 2r$ for various infidelities r, number of qubits $q \in [1, 10]$ and sequence length $m = 100$ using eq. (13) under the assumption of negligible SPAM. (similar plots can be made without this assumption). The number of sequences needed increases with decreasing infidelity, reflecting the generic statistical rule that higher accuracy requires more samples. Note that even in the case of infidelity $r = 2 \times 10^{-4}$ the number of sequences required is within experimental limits.

Scaling with sequence length

Of more immediate relevance is the scaling of the bound with the sequence length. We begin by looking at the regime of small sequence lengths using the inequalities

$$\frac{1-\chi^m}{1-\chi} \leq m, \qquad \frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2} \leq m, \tag{16}$$

which hold as $\chi, f^2 \leq 1$. Substituting these inequalities in eq. (9) gives eq. (13). We see that in this limit the variance scales quadratically with the infidelity r (or any a priori upper bound on r). This bound is valid for all sequence lengths m, but it becomes very loose for long sequences, that is, when $mr \approx 1$. This limit is experimentally relevant as estimates for sequences of length m such that $mr \approx 1$ are required to get a good fit to an exponential decay curve. In this regime we can upper bound the variance using lemma 7 (Supplementary Material) and obtain the asymptotic variance stated in eq. (11). Lemma 7 depends on the classification of all qubit CPTP maps and is hence not scalable to multiple qubit using current proof techniques. In this limit the variance bound scales linearly with r but is independent of m. The more refined bound eq. (12) interpolates smoothly between these two regimes but requires an estimate of the unitarity χ to work. In the absence of an estimate of χ eqs. (11) and (13) can be used. We illustrate the interpolation between these regimes by plotting the ratio between the variance bound and the infidelity r for various sequence lengths ($m \in \{10, 100, 1000, 10000\}$) in fig. 4.



FIG. 4. **Ratio between variance and infidelity.** This plot describes the ratio between the infidelity r (log scale) and the new variance bounds (eq. (9)) for different sequence lengths ($m \in \{10, 100, 1000, 10000\}$). For illustration we assume the unitarity χ to be equal to f^2 but similar plots can be made for different values of the unitarity χ. We also assume $d = 2$ and ideal SPAM (η =0). When $mr \ll 1$ the ratio approaches a constant (variance scales linearly in r), while for $mr \gg 1$ the ratio grows linearly (variance scales quadratically in r)

On this plot we see that for $mr \gg 1$ the ratio approaches a constant, i.e. the variance scales linearly in r and for $mr \ll 1$ the ratio rises linearly, i.e. the variance scales quadratically in r. Hence an estimate of the magnitude of the product mr can by used as a rule of thumb in order to decide upon which approximation to make.

It is also important to see how sequence length affects the amount of necessary sequences in different regimes of infidelity. This was already addressed in fig. 4 but it is instructive to see the effect of the

interpolation the amount of necessary sequences. Hence below we plot 5 for various values of the infidelity r the number of sequences needed for a 99% confidence interval of size $\epsilon = 2r$ but now varying the sequence length $m \in [1, 1000]$. For illustration we assume the unitarity χ to be equal to f^2 but similar plots can be made for different values of the unitarity χ. We also assume the system to be a single qubit $d = 2$ (eq. (9)) but the conclusion is similar for larger system sizes.



FIG. 5. **Number of sequences needed vs sequence length** Number of sequences needed (log scale) for a 99% confidence interval of size $\epsilon = 2 * r$ around $p_{m,N}$ for various infidelities r and sequence length in the interval $m \in [1, 1000]$ (log scale) using the variance eq. (9). For illustration we assume the unitarity χ to be equal to f^2 but similar plots can be made for different values of the unitarity χ. We also assume $d = 2$ and ideal SPAM (η =0). Note that the amount of sequences needed increases with decreasing infidelity. This reflects the generic statistical rule that higher accuracy requires more samples. Note also the saturation of the number of sequences needed in the limit $mr >> 1$.

Note again that smaller infidelities require larger amounts of sequences. Also nicely illustrated is the interpolation between quadratic scaling in r. for $mr >> 1$ the number of sequences needed becomes approximately constant. This is a consequence of the now linear scaling of the variance and the fact that we set the size of the confidence interval to be equal to the infidelity (this behavior also shows when setting the size of the confidence interval proportional to r). The conclusion here is that for $mr >> 1$ it is in the statistical sense not harder to do RB experiments for larger sequence lengths.

Effect of unitarity

In the limits of small and large sequence lengths we have the upper bounds for qubits eqs. (10) and (11) which are independent of the unitarity, but in the the intermediate regime and for multiple qubits, having knowledge of the unitarity χ can affect the number of sequences needed. In order to illustrate this we will plot the amount of sequences needed versus the infidelity r for various values of the unitarity χ. Note that the unitarity must always be larger than the square of the depolarizing parameter f^2, hence we will choose the unitarity χ to be $\chi = f^2 + \varepsilon$ where we choose $\varepsilon = q(1 - f^2)$ for various values of some parameter q which takes values in $\{0, 0.2, 0.5, 0.8, 0.9\}$. The sequence length will be $m = 400$ and we take a 99% confidence interval of size $\epsilon = 2r$ around $p_{m,N}$. The results are plotted in 6. On this plot we see that higher relative values of the unitarity χ have an impact on the amount of sequences needed. Hence in general it is useful to have some estimate of the unitarity to obtain sharper bounds. In an experimental setup it means that



FIG. 6. **Number of sequences needed vs infidelity for various values of the unitarity** Number of sequences needed for a 99% confidence interval of size $\epsilon = 2r$ versus the infidelity r for various relative values of the unitarity χ, parametrized by $\chi = f^2 + w \times (1 - f^2)$ with f the depolarizing parameter and w a parameter taking values in $\{0, 0.2, 0.5, 0.8, 0.9\}$ (using variance eq. (9) and taking $d = 2$ and $m = 400$). Note that for higher relative values of the unitarity one requires a larger number of sequences.

e.g. unitary over-rotations will require more resources to properly diagnose than e.g. depolarizing noise, for which $\chi = f^2$.

Effects of SPAM terms

In practice it will always be the case that the input state ρ and the output measurement POVM element Q are not ideal. This means that in general we must take into account the contributions from non-ideal SPAM when calculating the number of required sequences. These contributions scale linearly in the infidelity r (see eq. (14)) rather than quadratically and so will increase the amount of required sequences. The degree to which ρ and Q deviate from the ideal situation is captured by the prefactors $\eta, \hat{\eta}$ (see section IV for more on these factors). To illustrate the effect of the SPAM terms on the amount of sequences needed we plot in fig. 7 the number of sequences versus the infidelity r using eq. (14) for a 99% confidence interval of size $\epsilon = r$ taking the unitarity $\chi = f^2$, the sequence length $m = 100$ and the dimension of the system $d = 16$ (four qubits) for SPAM of size $\eta + \hat{\eta} \in \{0, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.5\}$ where we have absorbed the dimensional prefactors in eq. (14) into $\eta, \hat{\eta}$ for convenience. From this plot we note that for non-zero $\eta, \hat{\eta}$ the amount of sequences needed increases rapidly, especially in the regime of small r. This is due to the fact that increasing the SPAM contribution interpolates the variance between a regime where the terms quadratic in infidelity r are dominant and a regime where the terms linear in infidelity r are dominant. This means that, especially when dealing with systems with very small r it is advantageous to try to suppress SPAM errors. In section IV we show that this type of quadratic-to-linear interpolation behavior is in fact optimal for the variance of randomized benchmarking using any possible 2-design [30].



FIG. 7. **Number of sequences needed vs infidelity for various values of SPAM** Number of sequences needed for a 99% confidence interval of size $\epsilon = 2r$ versus the infidelity r (taking $\chi = f^2$, $d = 16$ and $m = 100$ for illustration) for various levels of SPAM $\eta + \hat{\eta} \in \{0, 0.01, 0.5, 0.1, 0.5\}$. Note that the size of the SPAM term has a strong influence on the amount of sequences required, especially in the small r limit.Note that, especially in the regime of small r increasing the SPAM contribution drastically increases the amount of sequences needed for a fixed confidence interval.

Future work

An important caveat when applying the confidence bounds is the assumption of gate and time independent noise (this can be relaxed to Markovian, gate independent noise [40]). This is an assumption that many analyses of RB suffer from to various degrees, hence a major open problem would be to generalize the current bounds to encompass more general noise models. Also, successful and rigorous randomized benchmarking not only depends on the number of random sequences needed per sequence length but also on the fitting procedure used to fit the points generated by randomized benchmarking of various lengths to a decay curve in order to extract an estimate of the average gate fidelity. Finding the optimal way to perform this fitting procedure is still an open problem [14]. Another major theoretical open problem is the extension of the present bounds to non-qubit systems, different varieties of randomized benchmarking [8, 12], and to different 2-designs [9, 12, 37]. If these 2-designs are assumed to be groups similar techniques from representation theory might be used [22] but how this would be done is currently unknown. Finally, we have only obtained sharp bounds in the limit of large sequence length for the case of a single qubit. This bound relied on the full classification of all CPTP qubit maps [36], which is an extremely strong result unlikely to be replicated for maps between arbitrary amounts of qubits. Hence new proof techniques might be needed to generalize eq. (11) to multiple qubits.

IV. METHODS

In this section, we will discuss the new contributions in detail, and explain how to apply them in an experimental setting. We will give a high level overview of the proof of the bound on the variance of a randomized benchmarking sequence; full details can be found in the Supplementary Material. We will also discuss the behavior of noise terms in the case of non-ideal SPAM and prove that the bounds we obtain are in some sense optimal.

A. Estimation theory

In this section, we review confidence intervals and relate the bounding of confidence intervals to the bounding of the variance of a distribution. A first thing of note is that all the variance bounds stated in section II are dependent on the infidelity r. The appearance of r in the bound might strike one as odd since this is precisely the quantity one tries to estimate through RB. It is however a general feature of estimation theory that one needs some knowledge of the quantity one tries to estimate in order to use nontrivial estimation methods [4]. Note that while our results are stated in frequentist language, they should also be translatable to Bayesian language, that is, as credible regions on the infidelity given prior beliefs as in Ref. [21] for example. Bayesian methods are more natural because our bounds depend on prior information about the infidelity, however, a full Bayesian treatment would involve the fitting process, obscuring our primary technical result, i.e. the variance bounds. We can in general define a $1-\delta$ confidence interval of size ϵ to be

$$\Pr\left[|P_{m,N} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{G}}(P_m)| \leq \epsilon\right] \geq 1-\delta. \tag{17}$$

Once we have an upper bound on the variance $\mathbb{V}_m^2$ of an RB distribution we can relate this to an upper bound on number of required sequences through the use use concentration inequalities. Note that for the case of randomized benchmarking there are two sets of confidence parameters. (δ_N, ϵ_N) is associated with estimating the average over all possible Clifford sequences, where the relevant parameter is the number of performed sequences N and (δ_K, ϵ_K) is associated with getting an estimate for the survival probability $p_m(\vec{G})$ for a given fixed sequence. Here the relevant parameter is K, the number of times a single sequence is performed. Since in practice $K < \infty$ there will be some finite (δ_K, ϵ_K) confidence region around the survival probability $p_m(\vec{G})$ for a given sequence $\vec{G}$. So in general, when looking at a ϵ, δ confidence region for an RB procedure of a given length on should look at $(\epsilon_N + \epsilon_K, \delta_N + \delta_K)$ confidence regions. In what follows we will assume that K is high enough such that ϵ_K, δ_K are negligible relative to (δ_N, ϵ_N). This approach is motivated by experimental realities where it is usually much easier to perform a single string of Cliffords many times quickly than it is to generate, store and implement a large number of random sequences. For a given variance $\mathbb{V}^2$ we can relate the number of sequences N needed to obtain $1-\delta$ confidence intervals of size ϵ using the following concentration inequality due to Hoeffding [24]:

$$\Pr\left[|P_{m,N} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{G}}(P_m)| \leq \epsilon\right] \geq 1-\delta \geq 1 - 2H(\mathbb{V}^2, \epsilon)^N, \tag{18}$$

with

$$H(\mathbb{V}^2, \epsilon) = \left(\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{1-\epsilon}{\mathbb{V}^2+1}} \left(\frac{\mathbb{V}^2}{\mathbb{V}^2+\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{\mathbb{V}^2+\epsilon}{\mathbb{V}^2+1}}. \tag{19}$$

We can invert this statement to express the number of necessary sequences N as a function of δ, r, ϵ as

$$N = -\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{\log(H(\mathbb{V}^2, \epsilon))}. \tag{20}$$

Note that this expression can also be inverted to yield a bound on δ, ε in terms of a given number of samples N. This identity heavily depends on the size of the variance $\mathbb{V}_m^2$. The main contributions of this paper, as stated in section II is the derivation of sharp bounds on the variance of an RB sequence of length m and average infidelity r on a system of dimension d. In the next section we will give an overview of the derivation of these bounds.

B. Variance bound

In this section we present a derivation of the multi-qubit variance bound in eq. (12) under the assumption of ideal input state ρ and output POVM element Q, i.e.

$$\rho = \frac{1}{d}(\mathbb{1} + P) \tag{21}$$

$$Q = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{1} + P) \tag{22}$$

$$\tag{23}$$

where P is some pre-specified target Pauli matrix (fig. 1). Under these ideal conditions we can guarantee that the variance scales quadratically in the infidelity r. We will focus on intuition and delegate most technical work to the Supplementary Material.

We assume that every experimental implementation of a Clifford gate $\hat{G}$ can be written as $\hat{G} = G \circ \Lambda$ for some fixed CPTP map Λ where G is the ideal Clifford gate. That is, we assume the noise is Markovian, constant and independent of the target gate. These assumptions can be relaxed partially [14, 39, 40], but determining the robustness to violations of these assumptions remains a crucial open problem.

The key to randomized benchmarking is that randomly applying elements of the Clifford group $\mathcal{C}$ and then inverting produces, on average, the depolarizing channel [11]

$$\mathcal{D}_f(\rho) = f\rho + \frac{1-f}{d}\mathbb{1}_d, \tag{24}$$

with the depolarizing parameter f related to the fidelity by [33]

$$F(\Lambda) = \frac{(d-1)f + 1}{d}\ . \tag{25}$$

Therefore applying a sequence of independently-random gates, and then inverting, produces $\mathcal{D}_{f^m}$ on average. Hence the expectation value of any operator decays as f^m on average.

The value of $p_m(\vec{G})$ for a fixed $\vec{G}$, and the variance over $\vec{G} \in \mathcal{C}_q$ are

$$p_m(\vec{G}) = \mathrm{Tr}\left(Q[\bigcirc_{j=1}^{m}(G_j^\dagger \circ \Lambda \circ G_j)](\Lambda(\rho))\right) \tag{26}$$

$$\mathbb{V}_m^2 = \mathbb{E}_{\vec{G}}[p_m(\vec{G})^2] - [\mathbb{E}_{\vec{G}}(p_m(\vec{G}))]^2 \tag{27}$$

respectively, where $\bigcirc_{j=1}^{m}\mathcal{T}_j := T_m \circ \ldots \circ \mathcal{T}_1$. We can use the identity $a^2 = a \otimes a$ for $a \in \mathbb{C}$, the distributivity and associativity of the tensor product, and the linearity of quantum channels to write this as [28, 40]

$$\mathbb{V}_m^2 = \mathrm{Tr}\left(Q^{\otimes 2}\left[T_{\mathcal{C}}(\Lambda^{\otimes 2})^{\circ m} - \left(T_{\mathcal{C}}(\Lambda)^{\circ m}\right)^{\otimes 2}\right], (\rho^{\otimes 2})\right), \tag{28}$$

where $\circ m$ denotes the m-fold composition, we have set $\rho \to \Lambda(\rho)$, and

$$T_{\mathcal{C}}(\Lambda) = \mathbb{E}_G(G^\dagger \circ \Lambda \circ G) = \mathcal{D}_f, \tag{29}$$

$$T_{\mathcal{C}}(\Lambda^{\otimes 2}) = \mathbb{E}_G\left[(G^\dagger \circ \Lambda \circ G)^{\otimes 2}\right]. \tag{30}$$

Using a telescoping series (lemma 2 in the Supplementary Material), we can reduce eq. (28) to a sum of m terms containing the difference

$$T_{\mathcal{C}}(\Lambda^{\otimes 2}) - T_{\mathcal{C}}(\Lambda)^{\otimes 2}. \tag{31}$$

The second term in eq. (31) is just two tensor copies of the depolarizing channel but the first term is trickier to analyze since we are now twirling over two tensor copies of the channel Λ. We can analyze this term using by studying the representation theory of the Clifford group [23] (See also Supplementary Material). The

main idea is that the twirl of two copies of the channel Λ can be decomposed into a sum of superoperators P_i (Which are not necessarily CPTP). We can use the representation theory of the Clifford group to write eq. (31) as

$$(T_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2}) - T_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{\Lambda})^{\otimes 2}) = \Big((\chi_{tr} - f^2)P_{tr} + (\chi_1 - f^2)P_1 + (\chi_2 - f^2)P_2 + \|\Lambda(\mathbb{1}) - \mathbb{1}\|_2^2 \, V_{tr,id} \Big). \tag{32}$$

The operators P_i are projectors with eigenvalues $\chi_i = \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda \circ P_i)$ (with the trace taken to be over the space of superoperators) onto different subrepresentations of the two tensor copy action of the Clifford group and $V_{tr,id}$ is an isomorphism between two equivalent representations tr and id. Note that the operators P_i and $V_{tr,id}$ do not depend on the noise channel Λ, all of this dependence is concentrated into the proportionality factors χ. Thus in the basis induced by the irreducible representations the operator eq. (31) is almost diagonal and we have reduced the complexity of bounding the variance to bounding the quantities

$$\chi_{tr} - f^2, \tag{33}$$
$$\chi_1 - f^2, \tag{34}$$
$$\chi_2 - f^2, \tag{35}$$
$$\|\Lambda(\mathbb{1}) - \mathbb{1}\|_2^2 . \tag{36}$$

and the overlaps of the SPAM with the relevant representation spaces. We can upper bound the final quantity by r^2 using [38, Theorem 7]. The first three quantities can be upper bounded simultaneously by r^2 by the use of various technical lemmas (lemmas 4 and 6). The end result of these calculations, which are presented in the supplementary materials is given by eq. (12). The fractional terms containing m are due to the use of the telescoping series and the closed form for a finite geometric sum, see Supplementary Materials for details.

C. SPAM terms

When Q, ρ do not satisfy eq. (21), (which will always happen in practice) the above derivation will not hold exactly and the deviation of Q, ρ from their ideal forms will introduce terms of order $\eta r, \hat{\eta} r$ i.e., terms which scale linearly and not quadratically in the infidelity r. Deriving an expression of the variance taking into account these these contributions is a little tedious so we will delegate it to the Supplementary Material and instead discuss the form of the prefactors $\eta, \hat{\eta}$. Let ρ be some non-ideal input state and let Q be some non-ideal observable. Note from eq. (21) that the ideal input state ρ and output POVM Q are related to a pre-chosen "target Pauli matrix" P. We also define the "generalized Bloch vector" components [7, 40] of ρ as $\rho_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \mathrm{Tr}(\rho P_i)$ where P_i is the i'th multi-qubit, non-identity Pauli matrix (see Supplementary Materials for more information). We define $Q_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \mathrm{Tr}(Q P_i)$ in the same manner. We have that $\eta, \hat{\eta}$ are of the form (see theorem 2)

$$\eta = \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ P_i \neq P}}^{d^2-1} Q_i \rho_i \tag{37}$$

$$\hat{\eta} = \frac{8\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{d}(d-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{d^2-1} \rho_i \sum_{(j,k) \in C_{P_i}} Q_j Q_k \tag{38}$$

where C_{P_i} is the index set $C_{P_i} = \{(j,k) | [P_j, P_i] = 0, P_i P_k = P_j\}$ of commuting Pauli matrices such that their product is proportional to the Pauli P_i. First of all note that for a single qubit $\hat{\eta}$ is trivial since no two non-trivial Pauli matrices commute with each other (this is easy to check). Note also that both terms are zero if the output POVM element is of the ideal form (eq. (21)). More generally the size of the two terms is limited by the product of the accuracies of preparation and measurement. Experimentally this means that

if one creates a good measurement, one has more latitude in choosing the input state away from the ideal noisy input state. This might be relevant as in many experimental systems it is easier to initialize in some (pure) ground state rather than the mixed state $\rho = \frac{1}{d}(\mathbb{1} + P)$. As an example we can consider randomized benchmarking on 2 qubits. As target Pauli matrix we can e.g. choose the two qubit Pauli $Z \otimes Z$. This means the ideal input state and output POVM would be.

$$\rho_{ideal} = \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} + Z \otimes Z) \tag{39}$$

$$Q_{ideal} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} + Z \otimes Z) \tag{40}$$

Now imagine that we are in the (realistic) situation where we can prepare not this ideal state ρ_{ideal} but the pure state ρ_{real} given as

$$\rho_{real} = |00\rangle\langle 00| = \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} + Z \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes Z + Z \otimes Z). \tag{41}$$

On the other hand we can measure the observable $Z \otimes Z$ with good accuracy (as it is a stabilizer measurement). Hence let's imagine that the actual POVM element Q_{real} is given by

$$Q_{real} = Q_{ideal} + \epsilon Z \otimes \mathbb{1} \tag{42}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is some small parameter (note that we are neglecting to account for the positivity requirement on Q_{real}, this however makes the argument easier and does not impact the result). Note that while Q_{real} is close to Q_{ideal} this is not at all true for ρ_{real} and ρ_{ideal}. However, if we write down the correction factors to the variance $\eta, \hat{eta}$ from their definition in eq. (37) we get

$$\eta = \rho_{Z\mathbb{1}} Q_{Z\mathbb{1}} = \frac{\epsilon}{8} \tag{43}$$

$$\hat{\eta} = \frac{8\sqrt{2}}{6} \rho_{\mathbb{1}Z} Q_{Z\mathbb{1}} Q_{ZZ} = \frac{\sqrt{2}\epsilon}{6} \tag{44}$$

where ρ_{ZZ} is the ZZ component of the Bloch vector of ρ_{real} (similarly for the other components). Note that both correction factors scale as ϵ with small prefactors. This means that the estimate of the variance is robust against large changes in the initial state, as long as the measurement can be performed with accuracy. Note finally that for a single qubit ($d = 2$) the state $\rho = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{1} + P)$ is actually pure for any choice of the Pauli matrix P. Hence for a qubit our RB protocol coincides with earlier versions of RB [27, 30] (choosing $P = Z$ and hence $\rho = |0\rangle\langle 0|$).

D. Optimality of maximal variance

In this section we will argue that the bounds on the variance in the case of non ideal SPAM are optimal in the sense that it is impossible for the variance to scale better that linearly in the infidelity r without making assumptions on the form of the input state ρ or the output POVM Q. For this we first need to introduce the concept of "symmetrization". Symmetrization is the addition of an extra step to the randomized benchmarking protocol where we, before applying strings of random gates to an input state ρ and then measuring, we first apply a random unitary gate R sampled from some set of symmetrization gates $\mathcal{R}$ to the input state (his would effectively constitute a "step 0" in fig. 1). At the end of the protocol we would then not only average over all strings sampled from the gate set but also over the gates sampled from the set $\mathcal{R}$. Variants of this idea have been experimentally implemented in e.g. [32]. Let us now analyze the variance of this "symmetrized" RB protocol for an arbitrary input state ρ and output POVM Q. From eq. (28) we can write the symmetrized variance as

$$\mathbb{V}^2_{m,\mathcal{R}} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{R}|} \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \mathrm{Tr}\left(Q^{\otimes 2} \left(T(\Lambda^{\otimes 2})^m - \left(T(\Lambda)^{\otimes 2} \right)^m \right) (R^{\otimes 2} \rho^{\otimes 2} R^{\otimes 2 \dagger}) \right) \tag{45}$$

Note that we could write down an equivalent procedure where we symmetrize over the output Q or even over both Q and ρ. Let us now see how this symmetrization effects the *maximal* variance, i.e. the variance of randomized benchmarking maximized over all input states ρ. We get

$$\max_{\rho} \mathbb{V}^2_{m,\mathcal{R}} = \max_{\rho} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{R}|} \sum_{R\in\mathcal{R}} \mathrm{Tr}\left(Q^{\otimes 2}\left(T(\Lambda^{\otimes 2})^{\circ m} - \left(T(\Lambda)^{\otimes 2}\right)^{\circ m}\right)(R^{\otimes 2}\rho^{\otimes 2}R^{\otimes 2\dagger})\right) \tag{46}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{R}|} \sum_{R\in\mathcal{R}} \max_{\rho} \mathrm{Tr}\left(Q^{\otimes 2}\left(T(\Lambda^{\otimes 2})^{\circ m} - \left(T(\Lambda)^{\otimes 2}\right)^{\circ m}\right)(R^{\otimes 2}\rho^{\otimes 2}R^{\otimes 2\dagger})\right) \tag{47}$$

$$= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{R}|} \sum_{R\in\mathcal{R}} \max_{R^\dagger\rho R} \mathrm{Tr}\left(Q^{\otimes 2}\left(T(\Lambda^{\otimes 2})^{\circ m} - \left(T(\Lambda)^{\otimes 2}\right)^{\circ m}\right)(\rho)\right) \tag{48}$$

$$= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{R}|} \sum_{R\in\mathcal{R}} \max_{\rho} \mathbb{V}^2_m \tag{49}$$

$$= \max_{\rho} \mathbb{V}^2_m, \tag{50}$$

where the third line holds because for any unitary R we have that $R\rho R^\dagger$ is a quantum state, hence we can absorb all individual R into the maximization. We also used the definition of the unsymmetrized variance $\mathbb{V}^2_m$ (eq. (28)). This derivation means that any form of symmetrization does not increase the variance maximized over the input states ρ. Note that if we consider the variance maximized over both the input state ρ and the output POVM element Q we can, by the same argument as above, also perform symmetrization over Q without increasing the variance of the RB sequence. Hence we also have the more general statement

$$\max_{\rho,Q} \mathbb{V}^2_m \geq \max_{\rho,Q} \mathbb{V}^2_{m,\mathcal{R}} \tag{51}$$

where the symmetrization is now understood to be over both ρ and Q. Note that $\mathcal{R}$ does not have to be a finite set for this derivation to hold. In particular we could try to symmetrize over the entire unitary group $U(d)$. This is not feasible experimentally (and also not very smart since it will essentially reduce the experiment to pure noise) but it is interesting to look at this protocol to establish lower bounds on the maximal variance. In particular we will show in the Supplementary material (see theorem 3) that if we symmetrize over the entire unitary group and consider a *unitary* noise channel Λ we get that the symmetrized variance is proportional to

$$\mathbb{V}^2_{m,U(d)} \approx 1 - f^{m2} \tag{52}$$

This means that if the noise channel Λ is unitary we have that the variance of randomized benchmarking goes as

$$\mathbb{V}^2_{m,U(d)} \approx 1 - (1 - \frac{dr}{d-1})^{2m} \approx r. \tag{53}$$

Hence by eq. (51) the variance of randomized benchmarking will, for some "adversarial" input states ρ and output POVM's Q, always scale at least linearly in the infidelity r. This means that the bounds eqs. (9) and (14) are essentially optimal in terms of scaling with infidelity. Note also that the argument in theorem 3 does not depend on the choice of 2-design used to perform randomized benchmarking, hence linear scaling of the variance of randomized benchmarking of the maximal variance is optimal even if one performs randomized benchmarking with a gate set different from the Clifford group. Note also that while symmetrization always decreases the maximal variance it might not decrease the variance for a fixed input state.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Le Phuc Thinh, Jeremy Ribeiro and David Elkouss for enlightening discussions. JH and SW are funded by STW Netherlands, NWO VIDI and an ERC Starting Grant. This research was

supported by the U.S. Army Research Office through grant numbers W911NF-14-1-0098 and W911NF-14-1-0103. STF was supported by the Australian Research Council via EQuS project number CE11001013 and by an Australian Research Council Future Fellowship FT130101744.

[1] D. M. Appleby, I. Bengtsson, S. Brierley, M. Grassl, D. Gross, and J.-Å. Larsson. The monomial representations of the clifford group. *Quantum Inf. Comput.*, 12(5):404, 2012. ISSN 15337146.

[2] S. Asaad, C. Dickel, N. K. Langford, S. Poletto, A. Bruno, M. A. Rol, D. Deurloo, and L. DiCarlo. Independent, extensible control of same-frequency superconducting qubits by selective broadcasting. *npj Quantum Inf.*, 2(April):16029, aug 2016. ISSN 2056-6387. doi:10.1038/npjqi.2016.29. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1508.06676http://www.nature.com/articles/npjqi201629.

[3] R. Barends, J. Kelly, A. Megrant, D. Veitia, A.Sank, E. Jeffrey, T. C. White, J. Mutus, A. G. Fowler, B. Campbell, Y. Chen, Z. Chen, B. Chiaro, A. Dunsworth, C. Neill, P. J. J. O'Malley, P. Roushan, A. Vainsencher, J. Wenner, A. N. Korotkov, A. N. Cleland, and J. M. Martinis. Superconducting quantum circuits at the surface code threshold for fault tolerance. *Nature*, 508(7497):500–3, apr 2014. ISSN 1476-4687. doi:10.1038/nature13171. URL http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24759412.

[4] J. V. Beck and K. J. Arnold. Parameter estimation in engineering and science. *AIChE Journal*, 24(2):367–367, 1978. ISSN 1547-5905. doi:10.1002/aic.690240233. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/aic.690240233.

[5] R. Blume-Kohout, J. K. Gamble, E. Nielsen, J. Mizrahi, J. D. Sterk, and P. Maunz. Robust, self-consistent, closed-form tomography of quantum logic gates on a trapped ion qubit. oct 2013. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1310.4492.

[6] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2004. ISBN 0521833787.

[7] I. L. Chuang and M. A. Nielsen. Prescription for experimental determination of the dynamics of a quantum black box. *J. Mod. Opt.*, 44(11-12):2455, nov 1997. ISSN 0950-0340. doi:10.1080/09500349708231894. URL http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09500349708231894.

[8] A. W. Cross, E. Magesan, L. S. Bishop, J. A. Smolin, and J. M. Gambetta. *Npj Quantum Information*, 2016.

[9] C. Dankert, R. Cleve, J. Emerson, and E. Livine. Exact and approximate unitary 2-designs and their application to fidelity estimation. *Phys. Rev. A*, 80(1):012304, jul 2009. ISSN 1050-2947. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.80.012304. URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.80.012304.

[10] L. DiCarlo, J. M. Chow, J. M. Gambetta, L. S. Bishop, B. R. Johnson, D. I. Schuster, J. Majer, A. Blais, L. Frunzio, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf. Demonstration of two-qubit algorithms with a superconducting quantum processor. *Nature*, 460(7252):240, 2009. ISSN 0028-0836. doi:10.1038/nature08121. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature08121.

[11] D. P. DiVincenzo, D. W. Leung, and B. M. Terhal. Quantum Data Hiding. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 48(3): 580–598, mar 2001. ISSN 0018-9448. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0103098.

[12] A. C. Dugas, J. J. Wallman, and J. Emerson. Characterizing Universal Gate Sets via Dihedral Benchmarking. aug 2015. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1508.06312.

[13] J. Emerson, R. Alicki, and K. Życzkowski. Scalable noise estimation with random unitary operators. *J. Opt. B*, 7(10):S347, oct 2005. ISSN 1464-4266. doi:10.1088/1464-4266/7/10/021. URL http://stacks.iop.org/1464-4266/7/i=10/a=021?key=crossref.0612a2d913e264bbddc29e955e77423d.

[14] J. M. Epstein, A. W. Cross, E. Magesan, and J. M. Gambetta. Investigating the limits of randomized benchmarking protocols. *Phys. Rev. A*, 89(6):062321, June 2014. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.89.062321.

[15] D. E. Evans and R. Hegh-Krohn. Spectral properties of positive maps on c*-algebras. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, s2-17(2):345–355, 1978. doi:10.1112/jlms/s2-17.2.345. URL http://jlms.oxfordjournals.org/content/s2-17/2/345.abstract.

[16] S. T. Flammia and Y.-K. Liu. Direct Fidelity Estimation from Few Pauli Measurements. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 106(23):230501, jun 2011. ISSN 0031-9007. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.230501. URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.230501.

[17] W. Fulton and J. Harris. *Representation Theory: A First Course*. Readings in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag New York, 2004. ISBN 978-1-4612-0979-9.

[18] J. P. Gaebler, A. M. Meier, T. R. Tan, R. Bowler, Y. Lin, D. Hanneke, J. D. Jost, J. P. Home, E. Knill, D. Leibfried, and D. J. Wineland. Randomized Benchmarking of Multiqubit Gates. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 108(26):260503, jun 2012. ISSN 0031-9007. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.260503. URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.260503.

[19] R. Goodman and N. R. Wallach. *Symmetry, Representations, and Invariants*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, 2009. ISBN 9780387798516.

[20] D. Gottesman. Theory of fault-tolerant quantum computation. *Phys. Rev. A*, 57(1):127, jan 1998. ISSN 1050-2947. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.57.127. URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.57.127.

[21] C. Granade, C. Ferrie, and D. G. Cory. Accelerated Randomized Benchmarking. *New J. Phys.*, 17(1):013042, 2014. ISSN 13672630. doi:10.1088/1367-2630/17/1/013042. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/17/1/013042.

[22] D. Gross, K. Audenaert, and J. Eisert. Evenly distributed unitaries: On the structure of unitary designs. *J. Math. Phys.*, 48(5):052104, 2007. ISSN 00222488. doi:10.1063/1.2716992. URL http://link.aip.org/link/JMAPAQ/v48/i5/p052104/s1&Agg=doi.

[23] J. Helsen, J. J. Wallman, and S. Wehner. The two copy representation of the multiqubit clifford group. 2016.

[24] W. Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58(301):13–30, 1963. ISSN 01621459. URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/2282952.

[25] A. S. Holevo. Additivity conjecture and covariant channels. *International Journal of Quantum Information*, 03(01):41–47, 2005. doi:10.1142/S0219749905000530. URL http://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/S0219749905000530.

[26] C. King. The capacity of the quantum depolarizing channel. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 49(1): 221–229, Jan 2003. ISSN 0018-9448. doi:10.1109/TIT.2002.806153.

[27] E. Knill, D. Leibfried, R. Reichle, J. Britton, R. B. Blakestad, J. D. Jost, C. Langer, R. Ozeri, S. Seidelin, and D. J. Wineland. Randomized benchmarking of quantum gates. *Phys. Rev. A*, 77(1):012307, jan 2008. ISSN 1050-2947. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.77.012307. URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.77.012307.

[28] E. Magesan, R. Blume-Kohout, and J. Emerson. Gate fidelity fluctuations and quantum process invariants. *Phys. Rev. A*, 84(1):012309, jul 2011. ISSN 1050-2947. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.84.012309. URL http://pra.aps.org/abstract/PRA/v84/i1/e012309http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.84.012309.

[29] E. Magesan, J. M. Gambetta, and J. Emerson. Scalable and Robust Randomized Benchmarking of Quantum Processes. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 106(18):180504, may 2011. ISSN 0031-9007. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.180504. URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.180504.

[30] E. Magesan, J. M. Gambetta, and J. Emerson. Characterizing quantum gates via randomized benchmarking. *Phys. Rev. A*, 85(4):042311, apr 2012. ISSN 1050-2947. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.85.042311. URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.85.042311.

[31] S. T. Merkel, J. M. Gambetta, J. A. Smolin, S. Poletto, A. D. Córcoles, B. R. Johnson, C. A. Ryan, and M. Steffen. Self-consistent quantum process tomography. *Phys. Rev. A*, 87(6):062119, jun 2013. ISSN 1050-2947. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.87.062119. URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.87.062119.

[32] J. T. Muhonen, A. Laucht, S. Simmons, J. P. Dehollain, R. Kalra, F. E. Hudson, S. Freer, K. M. Itoh, D. N. Jamieson, J. C. McCallum, A. S. Dzurak, and A. Morello. Quantifying the quantum gate fidelity of single-atom spin qubits in silicon by randomized benchmarking. *Journal of Physics Condensed Matter*, 27(15):154205, Apr. 2015. doi:10.1088/0953-8984/27/15/154205.

[33] M. A. Nielsen. A simple formula for the average gate fidelity of a quantum dynamical operation. *Phys. Lett. A*, 303(4):249, oct 2002. ISSN 03759601. doi:10.1016/S0375-9601(02)01272-0. URL http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0375960102012720.

[34] J. F. Poyatos, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller. Complete Characterization of a Quantum Process: The Two-Bit Quantum Gate. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 78(2):390, jan 1997. ISSN 0031-9007. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.78.390. URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.78.390.

[35] D. Prez-Garca, M. M. Wolf, D. Petz, and M. B. Ruskai. Contractivity of positive and trace-preserving maps under lp norms. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 47(8):083506, 2006. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.2218675. URL http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/journal/jmp/47/8/10.1063/1.2218675.

[36] M. B. Ruskai, S. Szarek, and E. Werner. An analysis of completely-positive trace-preserving maps on m2. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 347(1):159 – 187, 2002. ISSN 0024-3795. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3795(01)00547-X. URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S002437950100547X.

[37] P. S. Turner and D. Markham. Derandomizing quantum circuits with measurement-based unitary designs. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 116:200501, May 2016. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.200501. URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.200501.

[38] J. J. Wallman. Bounding experimental quantum error rates relative to fault-tolerant thresholds. 2015. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1511.00727.

[39] J. J. Wallman and J. Emerson. Bounding experimental quantum error rates relative to fault-tolerant thresholds. 2015. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.01098.

[40] J. J. Wallman and S. T. Flammia. Randomized benchmarking with confidence. *New J. Phys.*, 16(10):103032, oct 2014. ISSN 1367-2630. doi:10.1088/1367-2630/16/10/103032. URL http://stacks.iop.org/1367-2630/16/i=10/a=103032?key=crossref.f0d3ce1050f8d1f51d7d311740e43a2f.

[41] J. J. Wallman, M. Barnhill, and J. Emerson. Robust Characterization of Loss Rates. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 115(6):060501, 2015. ISSN 0031-9007. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.060501. URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.060501.

[42] J. J. Wallman, C. Granade, R. Harper, and S. T. Flammia. Estimating the Coherence of Noise. *New J. Phys.*, 17:113020, 2015. ISSN 1367-2630. doi:10.1088/1367-2630/17/11/113020. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/17/11/113020.

[43] J. J. Wallman, M. Barnhill, and J. Emerson. Robust characterization of leakage errors. *New J. Phys.*, 18(4):043021, 2016. ISSN 1367-2630. doi:10.1088/1367-2630/18/4/043021. URL http://stacks.iop.org/1367-2630/18/i=4/a=043021?key=crossref.7ef5a2d1daa3b6b75f4a9c8cb1f0f7c9.

[44] M. Wolf. Quantum channels operations: Guided tour. *Lecture Notes Available at http://www-m5.ma.tum.de/foswiki/pub/M5/Allgemeines/MichaelWolf/QChannelLecture.pdf.*, 2012.

Appendix A: Preliminaries

In this appendix we derive in detail the bound on the variance of a randomized benchmarking sequence in eq. (12). We begin by establishing some necessary notation and lemmas.

Let q be the number of qubits in the system, $d = 2^q$ be the dimension of the associated Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \simeq \mathbb{C}^d$, and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be the space of linear operators acting on $\mathcal{H}$. One of the central objects of quantum information is the set of Pauli observables,

$$X = |1\rangle\langle 0| + |0\rangle\langle 1|,\ Y = i|1\rangle\langle 0| - i|0\rangle\langle 1|,\ Z = |0\rangle\langle 0| - |1\rangle\langle 1|,$$

which are defined relative to an arbitrary orthonormal basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ of $\mathbb{C}^2$ (the computational basis). The q-qubit Pauli group $\mathcal{P}_q$ is the group of tensor products of q elements of $\langle X, Z, i\mathbb{1}_2\rangle$, where $\langle S\rangle$ denotes the group generated by the set S. We will denote elements of the group $\mathcal{P}$ as P. The q-qubit Clifford group $\mathcal{C}_q$ is the normalizer of $\mathcal{P}_q$ in $\mathrm{U}(d)$, that is,

$$\mathcal{C}_q = \{U \in \mathrm{U}(d) : U\mathcal{P}_q U^\dagger = \mathcal{P}_q\}.$$

Equivalently, $\mathcal{C}_q$ is the group generated by the phase gate (also called the $\pi/4$ gate), the Hadamard gate and the CNOT gate [1]. For brevity, we will refer to the multi-qubit Pauli and Clifford groups as simply the Pauli ($\mathcal{P}$) and Clifford ($\mathcal{C}$) groups respectively, where the number of qubits will be implicit from the context. For more details on the Pauli and Clifford groups see, for example, Refs. [1, 20].

Schur's lemma

We make heavy use of the following corollary of Schur's lemma, which is an essential result from representation theory. [17, 19].

Lemma 1. *Let G be a finite group and let $R : G \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be a representation of G on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with decomposition*

$$R \simeq \bigoplus_i R_i \otimes \mathbb{1}_{n_i}, \tag{A1}$$

*into **irreducible** representations R_i which occur with multiplicities n_i. Then for any linear operator $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$,*

$$\sum_{g\in G} R(g)AR(g)^\dagger = \sum_i \chi_i \left(\sum_{k_i=1}^{n_i} P_{k_i}\right) \tag{A2}$$

where P_{k_i} is the projector onto space V_{k_i} carrying the k'th equivalent copy of the representation R_i and the $n_i \times n_i$ matrix χ_i has entries

$$[\chi_i]_{k_i l_i} = \frac{1}{|P_i|}\sum_v \langle v^{k_i}, Av^{l_i}\rangle, \tag{A3}$$

where $|P_i|$ is the rank of the projector P_i and $\{v^{k_i}\}_v$ is an orthonormal basis for the k'th copy of the space carrying representation R_i and the product between χ_i and $\sum_{k_i=1}^{n_i} P_{k_i}$ is assumed to be the matrix χ_i acting on the space $\oplus_{k_i} V_{k_i}$ When there are no equivalent representations, eq. (A2) *becomes*

$$\sum_{g\in G} R(g)AR(g)^\dagger = \sum_i \chi_i P_i = \sum_i \frac{1}{|P_i|}\operatorname{Tr}(AP_i)P_i. \tag{A4}$$

Liouville representation

The proof is most conveniently presented in the Liouville representation [40] (or affine representation [44]) of quantum channels. This representation basically corresponds to fixing an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ according to the Hilbert-Schmidt or trace inner product,

$$\langle A, B\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(A^\dagger B) \quad \forall A, B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}), \tag{A5}$$

and proceeding from there. The advantages of this representation for our work are that it is a formal group representation of $\mathrm{U}(2^q)$ (and subgroups thereof) and that channel composition corresponds to matrix multiplication.

Let $\{B_j : j \in \mathbb{Z}_{d^2}\}$ be an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ with respect to the Hilbert Schmidt inner product. We can construct a map $|.\rangle\!\rangle : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathbb{C}^{d^2}$ by setting $|B_j\rangle\!\rangle = e_j$ (where e_j is the jth canonical basis vector for $\mathbb{C}^{d^2}$) and

$$|M\rangle\!\rangle = \sum_j \langle B_j, M\rangle |B_j\rangle\!\rangle. \tag{A6}$$

Defining $\langle\!\langle M| = |M\rangle\!\rangle^\dagger$, we then have

$$\langle\!\langle M|N\rangle\!\rangle = \langle M, N\rangle. \tag{A7}$$

Finally, as any quantum channel is a linear map, we have

$$|\Lambda(\rho)\rangle\!\rangle = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_{d^2}} |\Lambda(B_j)\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle B_j|\rho\rangle\!\rangle, \tag{A8}$$

so that we can represent any linear map $\Lambda : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ by the matrix

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_{d^2}} |\Lambda(B_j)\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle B_j|, \tag{A9}$$

where we use bold-face to distinguish the abstract channel from its matrix representation.

The Liouville representation has the nice properties (as can be easily checked) that the composition of channels is equivalent to matrix multiplication and that tensor products of channels correspond to tensor products of the corresponding Liouville matrices, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_1 \circ \Lambda_2 &\to \mathbf{\Lambda_1}\mathbf{\Lambda_2}, \\ \Lambda_1 \otimes \Lambda_2 &\to \mathbf{\Lambda_1} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda_2}. \end{aligned} \tag{A10}$$

The action of a channel on a density matrix corresponds to the standard matrix action, hence for a density matrix ρ and POVM element Q in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ we have

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}|\rho\rangle\!\rangle = |\Lambda(\rho)\rangle\!\rangle, \tag{A11}$$

$$\mathrm{Tr}(Q\Lambda(\rho)) = \langle\!\langle Q|\mathbf{\Lambda}|\rho\rangle\!\rangle. \tag{A12}$$

We will generally use the basis spanned by the *normalized* Pauli matrices $\{\sigma_0\} \cup \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q$ where $\sigma_0 = \mathbb{1}_d/\sqrt{d}$ with $d = 2^q$ is the normalized identity matrix and

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q := 2^{-q/2}\{\mathbb{1}_2, X, Y, Z\}^{\otimes q}\backslash\{\sigma_0\} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\{\mathbb{1}_2, X, Y, Z\}^{\otimes q}\backslash\{\sigma_0\}, \tag{A13}$$

is the set of normalized Hermitian Pauli matrices excluding the identity. We will denote these normalized Pauli matrices by by the Greek letters σ, τ, ν. It is easy to show that all these matrices are indeed orthonormal under the trace inner product eq. (A5). Considered as a representation of the unitary group $U(d)$,

the Liouville representation has two irreducible representations, spanned by the vectors $|\sigma_0\rangle\!\rangle$ (the trivial representation) and $\{|\tau\rangle\!\rangle : \tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\}$ (the adjoint representation) respectively [22].

In terms of the Liouville representation $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ of a channel Λ in the basis eq. (A13) we also quote the following useful alternative form of the unitarity χ of a quantum channel Λ, namely [42]:

$$\chi := \frac{1}{d^2-1} \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \langle\!\langle \tau | \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{\Lambda}^\dagger | \tau \rangle\!\rangle. \tag{A14}$$

Twirling

A central ingredient of randomized benchmarking is the notion of twirling, that is, averaging a quantum channel over a set of unitaries $G = \{g\}_g$. The G-twirl $T_G(\Lambda)$ of a channel Λ is

$$T_G(\Lambda)(\rho) = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} g \Lambda(g^\dagger \rho g) g^\dagger \qquad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}), \tag{A15}$$

or, equivalently,

$$T_G(\Lambda)(\rho) = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} \Lambda_g \circ \Lambda \circ \Lambda_{g^\dagger}(\rho) \qquad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}), \tag{A16}$$

where $\Lambda_g(\rho) = g \rho g^\dagger$. We can rewrite this in Liouville form as

$$T_G(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \sum_{g \in G} \mathbf{g} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{g}^\dagger \tag{A17}$$

by eq. (A10) where $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_g$. A set G is a **unitary 2-design** if and only if the G-twirl of any channel is the same as the $\mathrm{U}(d)$-twirl [22], that is, if

$$T_G(\Lambda) = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} g \Lambda(g^\dagger \rho g) g^\dagger = \int_{U(d)} dU U \Lambda(U^\dagger \rho U) U^\dagger = T_{\mathrm{U}(d)}(\Lambda)(\rho) \qquad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}), \tag{A18}$$

or in the Liouville representation

$$T_G(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} \mathbf{g} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{g}^\dagger = \int_{U(d)} dU \mathbf{U} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{U}^\dagger = T_{\mathrm{U}(d)}(\mathbf{\Lambda}). \tag{A19}$$

where $\mathrm{d}U$ is the uniform Haar measure on $\mathrm{U}(d)$. The Clifford group $\mathcal{C}$ is an example of a unitary 2-design [9, 11]. From the previous section we know that the Liouville representation $\mathbf{U}$ of the unitary group has two irreducible inequivalent representations: the trivial and adjoint representations, spanned by $\{|\sigma_0\rangle\!\rangle\}$ and $\{|\tau\rangle\!\rangle : \tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\}$ respectively. This means we can write the twirl, using Schur's lemma (lemma 1), as

$$T_G(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \chi_{id}(\Lambda) |\sigma_0\rangle\!\rangle \langle\!\langle \sigma_0| + f(\Lambda) \left(\sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} |\tau\rangle\!\rangle \langle\!\langle \tau| \right) \tag{A20}$$

where

$$f(\Lambda) = \frac{1}{d^2-1} \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \langle\!\langle \tau | \mathbf{\Lambda} | \tau \rangle\!\rangle \tag{A21}$$

and

$$\chi(\Lambda) = \langle\langle \sigma_0 | \mathbf{\Lambda} | \sigma_0 \rangle\rangle = 1, \tag{A22}$$

since Λ is CPTP. Note that $T(\Lambda)$ is precisely a depolarizing channel with depolarizing parameter f. This can be seen by considering the standard form of a depolarizing channel [26],

$$\mathcal{D}_{\hat{f}}(X) = \hat{f}X + (1-\hat{f})\frac{\mathrm{Tr}(X)\mathbb{1}}{d}, \tag{A23}$$

with depolarizing parameter $\hat{f} \in [-\frac{1}{d^2-1}, 1]$ which has a corresponding Liouville representation $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{D}}_{\hat{f}}$ in the basis of normalized Pauli matrices $\{\sigma_0, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\}$ (eq. (A13)) with entries

$$[\boldsymbol{\mathcal{D}}_{\hat{f}}]_{\tau\tau'} = \langle\langle \tau | \boldsymbol{\mathcal{D}}_{\hat{f}} | \tau' \rangle\rangle = \langle \tau, \mathcal{D}_{\hat{f}}(\tau') \rangle \tag{A24}$$

$$= \hat{f}\langle \tau, \tau' \rangle + (1-\hat{f})\,\mathrm{Tr}(\tau')\langle \tau, \sigma_0 \rangle \tag{A25}$$

$$= \hat{f}\delta_{\tau\tau'} + (1-\hat{f})\delta_{\tau\sigma_0}\delta_{\tau'\sigma_0} \qquad \tau, \tau' \in \{\sigma_0, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\} \tag{A26}$$

Now setting $\hat{f} = f(\Lambda)$ we recover eq. (A20).

Telescoping series

In the variance bound we will make use of the following general telescoping series stated in Ref. [42].

Lemma 2. *For two arbitrary elements A, B of an algebra with associative and distributed addition and multiplication,*

$$A^m - B^m = \sum_{j=1}^{m} A^{m-j}(A-B)B^{j-1}. \tag{A27}$$

Proof. We will prove this by induction. For $m = 1$ the statement is trivial. For $m+1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^{m+1} A^{m-j+1}(A-B)B^{j-1} &= (A-B)B^m + A\sum_{j=1}^{m} A^{m-j}(A-B)B^{j-1} \\ &= AB^m - B^{m+1} + A^{m+1} - AB^m \\ &= A^{m+1} - B^{m+1}.\end{aligned}$$

■

Non-unitality bound

In order to bound some terms in the variance bound we require the following lemma, proven in [38, Theorem 7]. We will just state the result

Lemma 3. *Let Λ be a quantum channel. Then we define the **non-unital vector** α as*

$$[\alpha]_\tau = \langle \tau, \Lambda(\sigma_0) \rangle \qquad \tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q, \tag{A28}$$

with $\sigma_0, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q$ defined as in eq. (A13). We now have the following bound in terms of the infidelity r of the channel Λ:

$$\|\alpha\|_2^2 = \langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle \leq 2\frac{(d+1)^2}{d} r, \tag{A29}$$

where $\|.\|_2$ is the euclidean norm of the vector α.

Appendix B: Variance bound

In this section we present proofs for the main statements made in the text. In theorem 1 we derive a bound on the variance of a randomized benchmarking experiment valid for a system of arbitrary many qubits under the assumption that the input state ρ and the output POVM Q are ideal. In this idealized case we can prove a bound on the variance that is quadratic in the infidelity r. In theorem 2 we relax the conditions on ρ, Q leading to a bound on the variance that contains a term linear in infidelity r. Finally in theorem 3 we prove that the bound proven in theorem 2 is optimal when one allows for arbitrary input states ρ and output POVM's Q.

Variance bound assuming ideal SPAM

We begin by assuming that the input state ρ and output POVM Q are **noise free** (eq. (21) in the main text), i.e.

$$\rho = \frac{\sigma_0}{\sqrt{d}} + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{d}} \tag{B1}$$

$$Q = \frac{\mathbb{1}}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{d}\sigma}{2} \tag{B2}$$

where we choose $\sigma = \frac{P}{\sqrt{d}} \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q$ to be the normalized version of the target Pauli matrix P we discussed in the main text (see Figure 1 in the main text). Under these assumptions we have the following theorem on the variance of randomized benchmarking.

Theorem 1. *Let $\Lambda : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be a quantum channel with infidelity $r = \frac{(d-1)}{d}(1-f)$ and unitary χ, and let ρ, Q satisfy eq.* (B1)*. Then the variance $\mathbb{V}_m^2$ of the survival probability $p_m(\vec{G})$ over RB sequences $\vec{G} \in \mathcal{C}^{\times m}$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{V}_m^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\vec{G}}[p_m(\vec{G})^2] - [\mathbb{E}_{\vec{G}}(p_m(\vec{G}))]^2 \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1-\chi^m}{1-\chi}\right)\frac{d+1}{d-1}r^2 + \left(\frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2}\right)\left(\frac{d^2-2}{(d-1)^2}\right)r^2.\end{aligned} \tag{B3}$$

Proof. The goal is to upper bound the variance of an RB procedure by terms which scale quadratically in infidelity r. We begin by obtaining an exact expression for the variance which we then evaluate using the representation theory developed in the companion paper [23]. By this representation theory approach we can rewrite the variance as a sum of relatively simple terms which we then individually upper bound by terms proportional to r^2 using various lemma's. The variance for a fixed sequence length m from eq. (28) can be written in the Liouville representation as

$$\mathbb{V}_m^2 = \langle\langle Q^{\otimes 2}| \Big([T_{\mathcal{C}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2})]^m - [T_{\mathcal{C}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})^{\otimes 2}]^m \Big) |\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\rangle \tag{B4}$$

By the telescoping series (lemma 2) we can write,

$$\mathbb{V}_m^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \langle\langle Q^{\otimes 2}| [T_{\mathcal{C}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2})]^{m-j} \Big(T_{\mathcal{C}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2}) - T_{\mathcal{C}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})^{\otimes 2} \Big) [T_{\mathcal{C}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})^{\otimes 2}]^{j-1} |\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\rangle. \tag{B5}$$

The key difficulty is to evaluate the difference between the two twirled operators in eq. (B5). The twirl of a single copy, $T_{\mathcal{C}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})$ will be a depolarizing channel as we have seen in eq. (A20). In the Liouville representation, using the basis defined by the normalized Pauli matrices $\{\sigma_0, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\}$ as defined in eq. (A13) this becomes,

$$T_{\mathcal{C}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{D}} = |\sigma_0\rangle\rangle\langle\langle\sigma_0| + f \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} |\tau\rangle\rangle\langle\langle\tau|. \tag{B6}$$

On the other hand, the twirl of two copies,

$$T_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2}) = \sum_{g\in\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{g}^{\otimes 2}\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2}{\mathbf{g}^{\dagger}}^{\otimes 2}, \tag{B7}$$

does not have a straightforward decomposition. However, since we made the explicit choice of twirling over the Clifford group $\mathcal{C}$,eq. (B7) will be block-diagonal with respect to the irreducible representations of $\mathcal{C}$ in the representation $\mathbf{g}^{\otimes 2}$ by lemma 1. In the companion paper [23], we completely characterize these subrepresentations. We will quote results from this paper as needed. We will write the Liouville representation $T_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2})$ in the Pauli tensor product basis given by

$$\{\sigma_0, \boldsymbol{\sigma_q}\}^{\otimes 2} := \{|\sigma_0\sigma_0\rangle\rangle, |\sigma_0\tau\rangle\rangle, |\tau'\sigma_0\rangle\rangle, |\nu\mu\rangle\rangle : \tau, \tau', \mu, \nu \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\} \tag{B8}$$

where we use the shorthand $|\tau\tau'\rangle\rangle = |\tau\rangle\rangle \otimes |\tau\rangle\rangle$ for the tensor product. We begin by observing (from [23]) that in this basis the representation $\mathbf{g}^{\otimes 2}$ of the Clifford group $\mathcal{C}$ can be decomposed into six subrepresentations spanned by

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{id} &= \text{span}\{|\sigma_0\sigma_0\rangle\rangle\} && \text{(trivial)}\\
V_r &= \text{span}\{|\sigma_0\tau\rangle\rangle : \tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\} && \text{(right adjoint)}\\
V_l &= \text{span}\{|\tau\sigma_0\rangle\rangle : \tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\} && \text{(left adjoint)}\\
V_d &= \text{span}\{|\tau\tau\rangle\rangle : \tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\} && \text{(diagonal)}\\
V_S &= \text{span}\{S_{\nu,\tau} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\nu\tau\rangle\rangle + |\tau\nu\rangle\rangle) : \tau, \nu \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q, \tau \neq \nu\} && \text{(symmetric)}\\
V_A &= \text{span}\{A_{\nu,\tau} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\nu\tau\rangle\rangle - |\tau\nu\rangle\rangle) : \tau, \nu \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q, \tau \neq \nu\} && \text{(anti-symmetric)}
\end{aligned}$$

We will denote the representation carried by a space V_i by R_i and the projector onto the space V_i by P_i. We have ([23]) that the representations R_r, R_l are equivalent to the adjoint representation discussed in eq. (A20) and are hence irreducible. We also have ([23]) that R_{id} is the trivial representation and hence irreducible. The representations R_A, R_S, R_d however are not irreducible and will decompose further. It is easy to check that for any Q, ρ the following holds

$$P_A|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\rangle = 0 \tag{B9}$$

$$\langle\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|P_A = 0, \tag{B10}$$

where P_A is the projector onto the space V_A . This means we can ignore any internal structure of the representation R_A. Note also that for Q, ρ such that eq. (B1) holds we have that

$$P_S|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\rangle = 0 \tag{B11}$$

$$\langle\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|P_S = 0, \tag{B12}$$

which means we can ignore the internal structure of R_S as well. Note that this will not be the case if Q, ρ do not verify eq. (B1), we will consider this case in theorem 2. Note that even if R_A, R_S contain subrepresentations that are equivalent to R_r, R_l, R_{id} or a subrepresentation of R_d, which induces cross-terms (as seen in lemma 1) these cross-terms will still be projected out by the orthogonality relations eqs. (B9) and (B11) when taking the inner product in eq. (B5). This means that the only relevant contributions to eq. (B7) will be given by R_{id}, R_r, R_l and the subrepresentations of R_d. For $q \geq 2$ the representation R_d falls apart into three irreducible inequivalent representations which we denote by R_{tr} (trivial), R_1 and R_2. The representation R_{tr} is equivalent to the representation R_{id} and is carried by the space

$$V_{tr} = \text{span}\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{d^2-1}}\sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q}|\tau\tau\rangle\rangle\right\} \tag{trivial}$$

The representations R_1, R_2 are inequivalent to all other representations in the decomposition of $\mathbf{g}^{\otimes 2}$. It is possible to write down explicit bases for the spaces V_1, V_2 but we will not need anything more than the guarantee that they are inequivalent.

Now we can begin our analysis of eq. (B7). Using Schur's lemma (lemma 1) we can decompose the two copy twirl operator into projectors having support on the irreducible representations of the two copy Liouville representation of the Clifford group. In the notation of lemma 1 can write eq. (B7) as:

$$T_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2}) = \chi_{tr,id}(P_{tr} + P_{id}) + \chi_{r,l}(P_r + P_l) + \chi_1 P_1 + \chi_2 P_2, \tag{B13}$$

There are two sets of equivalent representations present here. We begin by analyzing the first one, carried by the spaces V_{tr} and V_{id}. The matrix $\chi_{tr,id}$ is, through the use of lemma 1, a two by two matrix of the form

$$\chi_{tr,id} = \begin{pmatrix} \langle \sigma_0\sigma_0, \Lambda(\sigma_0)\Lambda(\sigma_0)\rangle & \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \frac{\langle \sigma_0\sigma_0, \Lambda(\tau)\Lambda(\tau)\rangle}{\sqrt{d^2-1}} \\ \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \frac{\langle \tau\tau, \Lambda(\sigma_0)\Lambda(\sigma_0)\rangle}{\sqrt{d^2-1}} & \sum_{\tau,\tau'\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \frac{\langle \tau\tau, \Lambda(\tau')\Lambda(\tau')\rangle}{d^2-1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \frac{\langle \alpha,\alpha\rangle}{\sqrt{d^2-1}} & \chi_{tr} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B14}$$

Here we used that Λ is TP to calculate the top row and α is the non-unital vector as defined in eq. (A28). We have also used the following property of the vector supporting the trivial representation [42]:

$$\langle\langle \alpha^{\otimes 2}| \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \tau\tau\rangle\rangle = \langle \alpha, \alpha\rangle = \|\alpha\|_2^2 \tag{B15}$$

Now in the same manner we can consider the equivalence between the representations R_r, R_l giving rise to the matrix

$$\chi_{r,l} = \begin{pmatrix} f & 0 \\ 0 & f \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B16}$$

where we again used that Λ is TP to evaluate the off-diagonals and used the definition of f (eq. (A21)) to evaluate the diagonal. Using these characterizations and excluding contributions from V_A and V_S we can reduce eq. (B13) to

$$T_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2}) = P_{id} + fP_r + fP_l + \chi_{tr}P_{tr} + \chi_1 P_1 + \chi_2 P_2 + \frac{\|\alpha\|_2^2}{d^2-1} |\sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \tau\tau\rangle\rangle\langle\langle \sigma_0\sigma_0|. \tag{B17}$$

Note from eq. (B6) that we can write the other twirl, in the basis eq. (B8), as

$$T_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{\Lambda})^{\otimes 2} = |\sigma_0\sigma_0\rangle\rangle\langle\langle \sigma_0\sigma_0| + f\sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} |\sigma_0\tau\rangle\rangle\langle\langle \sigma_0\tau| + f\sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} |\tau\sigma_0\rangle\rangle\langle\langle \tau\sigma_0| + f^2 \sum_{\tau,\nu\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} |\nu\tau\rangle\rangle\langle\langle \nu\tau|. \tag{B18}$$

Isolating the relevant subspaces (excluding V_A, V_S) this becomes

$$T_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{\Lambda})^{\otimes 2} = P_{id} + fP_r + fP_l + f^2(P_{tr} + P_1 + P_2). \tag{B19}$$

This means that the difference operator in eq. (B36) becomes

$$T_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2}) - T_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{\Lambda})^{\otimes 2} = (\chi_{tr} - f^2)P_{tr} + (\chi_1 - f^2)P_1 + (\chi_2 - f^2)P_2 + \frac{\|\alpha\|_2^2}{d^2-1} |\sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \tau\tau\rangle\rangle\langle\langle \sigma_0\sigma_0|. \tag{B20}$$

This means we can write the relevant part of the operator in eq. (B5) as

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} T_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2})^{m-j}\Big(T_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2}) - T_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{\Lambda})^{\otimes 2}\Big)(T_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{\Lambda})^{\otimes 2})^{j-1} \tag{B21}$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(P_{id} + \chi_{tr}P_{tr} + \chi_1 P_1 + \chi_2 P_2 + \frac{\|\alpha\|_2^2}{d^2-1}|\sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q}\tau\tau\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle\sigma_0\sigma_0|\right)^{m-j} \tag{B22}$$

$$\times\left((\chi_{tr}-f^2)P_{tr} + (\chi_1 - f^2)P_1 + (\chi_2 - f^2)P_2 + \|\alpha\|_2^2|\sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q}|\tau\tau\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle\sigma_0\sigma_0|\right) \tag{B23}$$

$$\times\left(f^2P_{tr} + f^2P_1 + f^2P_2\right)^{j-1}. \tag{B24}$$

Inserting this operator into eq. (B5) and working out we get the following expression for the variance

$$\mathbb{V}_m^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{m}\Bigg[\chi_{tr}^{m-j}\left(\frac{\|\alpha\|_2^2}{d^2-1}\langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|\sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q}\tau\tau\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle\sigma_0\sigma_0|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\!\rangle\right) \tag{B25}$$

$$+\left(\chi_{tr}^{m-j}f^{2(j-1)}(\chi_{tr}-f^2)\langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|P_{tr}|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\!\rangle\right) \tag{B26}$$

$$+\left(\chi_1^{m-j}f^{2(j-1)}(\chi_1-f^2)\langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|P_1|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\!\rangle\right) \tag{B27}$$

$$+\left(\chi_2^{m-j}f^{2(j-1)}(\chi_2-f^2)\langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|P_2|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\!\rangle\right)\Bigg]. \tag{B28}$$

In terms eqs. (B26) to (B28) we make can the approximation $\chi_{tr}, \chi_1, \chi_2 \leq 1$ which holds since Λ is CPTP [40]. Note that we do not do this is in the $(\chi_i - f^2)$ factors, only in the summations! This gives

$$\mathbb{V}_m^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{m}\Bigg[\chi_{tr}^{m-j}\frac{\|\alpha\|_2^2}{d^2-1}\langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|\sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q}\tau\tau\rangle\!\rangle\langle\!\langle\sigma_0\sigma_0|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\!\rangle \tag{B29}$$

$$+\left(f^{2(j-1)}(\chi_{tr}-f^2)\langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|P_{tr}|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\!\rangle\right) \tag{B30}$$

$$+\left(f^{2(j-1)}(\chi_1-f^2)\langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|P_1|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\!\rangle\right) \tag{B31}$$

$$+\left(f^{2(j-1)}(\chi_2-f^2)\langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|P_2|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\!\rangle\right)\Bigg]. \tag{B32}$$

Because ρ and Q are such that eq. (B1) hold we can make the following deductions:

$$\langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|P_{tr}|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\!\rangle = \frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{d^2-1} \tag{B33}$$

$$\langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|P_1|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\!\rangle = \frac{1}{4}\frac{|P_1|}{d^2-1}, \tag{B34}$$

$$\langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|P_2|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\!\rangle = \frac{1}{4}\frac{|P_2|}{d^2-1}, \tag{B35}$$

where $|P_i|$ is the rank of the projector P_i. We delegate the derivation of these equations to lemma 4. Contracting the geometric sums and inserting eqs. (B33) to (B35) we get

$$\mathbb{V}_m^2 = \|\alpha\|_2^2\frac{1}{d}\frac{\langle\vec{Q},\vec{Q}\rangle}{d^2-1}\left(\frac{1-\chi_{tr}^m}{1-\chi_{tr}}\right) + \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{d^2-1}\right)(\chi_{tr} + |P_1|\chi_1 + |P_2|\chi_2 - (d^2-1)f^2), \tag{B36}$$

with $\langle \vec{Q}, \vec{Q} \rangle := \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \mathrm{Tr}(Q\tau)^2 \leq d^2$. Note that up until this point the expression for the variance is still exact! We will now start upper bounding the individual terms in eq. (B36). We can upper bound the first term in eq. (B36) by r^2 using lemma 3, that is

$$\|\alpha\|_2^2 \leq 2\frac{(d+1)^2}{d} r^2. \tag{B37}$$

The second term in eq. (B36) is a little trickier because we require a good expression for the sum $\chi_{tr} + |P_1|\chi_1 + |P_2|\chi_2$. For that we have the following pair of equations which we prove as lemmas in the next section:

$$\text{[lemma 5]} \qquad \chi_{tr} + |P_1|\chi_1 + |P_2|\chi_2 = \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau}^2 \tag{B38}$$

$$\text{[lemma 6]} \qquad 1 - \frac{2d}{d-1} r + \frac{d^2}{(d-1)^2} r^2 \leq \frac{1}{d^2-1} \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau}^2 \leq 1 - \frac{2d}{d-1} r + \frac{2(d+1)}{(d-1)} r^2, \tag{B39}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau} = \langle \tau, \Lambda(\tau) \rangle$ is a diagonal element of the Liouville representation of Λ. With these identities in hand let us now single out the difference term in equation eq. (B36). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\chi_{tr}}{d^2-1} + \frac{|P_1|}{d^2-1}\chi_1 + \frac{|P_2|}{d^2-1}\chi_2 - f^2 &= \frac{1}{d^2-1} \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau}^2 - (1 - \frac{2d}{d-1} r + \frac{d^2}{(d-1)^2} r^2) && \text{(B40)} \\
&\leq 1 - \frac{2d}{d-1} r + \frac{2(d+1)}{(d-1)} r^2 - 1 + \frac{2d}{d-1} r - \frac{d^2}{(d-1)^2} r^2 && \text{(B41)} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{2(d+1)}{(d-1)} - \frac{d^2}{(d-1)^2} \right) r^2, && \text{(B42)}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $f = 1 - \frac{dr}{d-1}$ and expanded the square. If we now fill this into eq. (B36) and use the bound from lemma 3 we obtain the final variance bound as

$$\mathbb{V}_m^2 \leq 2 \left(\frac{1 - \chi_{tr}^m}{1 - \chi_{tr}} \right) \frac{d+1}{d-1} r^2 + \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1 - f^{2m}}{1 - f^2} \right) \left(\frac{2(d+1)}{(d-1)} - \frac{d^2}{(d-1)^2} \right) r^2. \tag{B43}$$

We can simplify the dimensional factors to

$$\mathbb{V}_m^2 \leq 2 \left(\frac{1 - \chi_{tr}^m}{1 - \chi_{tr}} \right) \frac{d+1}{d-1} r^2 + \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1 - f^{2m}}{1 - f^2} \right) \left(\frac{d^2-2}{(d-1)^2} \right) r^2. \tag{B44}$$

Note now that by definition of unitarity (eq. (A14)) we have that $\chi_{tr} = \chi$ and hence we have found the required bound on the variance of a randomized benchmarking sequence. ■

Variance bound for non-ideal SPAM

In theorem 1 we assumed the input state ρ and the output POVM Q to be of an ideal form (eq. (B1)). In the next theorem we will investigate what happens when this assumption is violated. To do this, we write

$$Q = Q_0 \sigma_0 + Q_\sigma \sigma + \tilde{Q}, \tag{B45}$$

$$\rho = \frac{\sigma_0}{d} + \rho_\sigma \sigma + \tilde{\rho}, \tag{B46}$$

where $\tilde{Q}, \tilde{\rho}$ are Hermitian matrices orthogonal (in the Hilbert-Schmidt sense) to σ_0, σ and $Q_0, Q_\sigma, \rho_\sigma$ are prefactors such that the total ρ is a density matrix and Q is a valid POVM element. We also still take σ to be the normalized version of the target Pauli matrix P (as in eq. (B1) and Figure 1 in the main text). We now have the following "noisy" version of theorem 1.

Theorem 2. *Let $\Lambda : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be a quantum channel with infidelity $r = \frac{(d-1)}{d}(1-f)$, unitarity χ and ρ, Q be defined as in eqs.* (B45) *and* (B46)*. Then the variance $\mathbb{V}_m^2$ of an RB round with sequences of length m using the multi-qubit Clifford group $\mathcal{C}$ is upper bounded by*

$$\mathbb{V}_m^2 \leq 2\left(\frac{1-\chi^m}{1-\chi}\right)\frac{d+1}{d-1}r^2 + \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2}\right)\left(\frac{d^2-2}{(d-1)^2}\right)r^2 + \frac{d}{d-1}\frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2}\eta r + \frac{\sqrt{2}d}{d-1}\frac{1-f^m}{1-f}\hat{\eta}r, \quad \text{(B47)}$$

where $\eta, \hat{\eta}$ are functions solely of Q, ρ.

Proof. Note first that the proof of theorem 1 is independent of Q, ρ until eq. (B5). This means we can start the derivation of eq. (B47) from eq. (B5). The relaxation of the conditions in eq. (B1) has two major consequences. The first consequence is that eq. (B11) will no longer hold, i.e. $\rho^{\otimes 2}$ and $Q^{\otimes 2}$ are no longer orthogonal the symmetric space V_S. This means we have to investigate the subrepresentations of the symmetric representation R_S. A second consequence is that we can no longer apply lemma 4 to bound the difference of twirls in eq. (B36) by r^2. These changes will gives rise to terms that are linear in the infidelity r.

We will begin by investigating the subrepresentations of R_S. From the companion paper [23] we get that the representation R_S falls apart into **five** irreducible, inequivalent subrepresentations denoted by $R_{[adj]}, R_{\{S\}_1}, R_{\{S\}_1}, R_{[S]_1}, R_{[S]_2}$. We also get that the representation $R_{[adj]}$ is equivalent to the adjoint representation and hence equivalent to R_l, R_r as defined in theorem 1. We can write down a basis for $V_{[adj]}$ of the following form [23]:

$$V_{[adj]} = \text{span}\left\{ |\tau^{[adj]}\rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d^2-4}} \sum_{\nu,\hat{\nu} \in C_\tau} (|\nu\hat{\nu}\rangle\rangle + |\hat{\nu}\nu\rangle\rangle) : \tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q \right\} \quad \text{(B48)}$$

where $C_\tau = \{(\nu, \hat{\nu}) : \nu, \hat{\nu} \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q, [\nu, \tau] = 0, \hat{\nu} = \sqrt{d}\nu\tau\}$ is the set of pairs of normalized commuting non-identity Pauli matrices such that their matrix product is proportional to τ. The other four representations have no equivalent representations present in $\mathbf{g}^{\otimes 2}$. It is possible to write down explicit bases carrying these representations [23] but we will not need them for this proof. Following the logic of theorem 1 and lemma 1 we can write the two copy twirl $T_{\mathcal{C}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2})$ as

$$T_{\mathcal{C}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2}) = \chi_{id,st}(P_{id} + P_{st}) + \chi_{r,l,[adj]}(P_r + P_l + P_{[adj]}) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Z}} \chi_i P_i \quad \text{(B49)}$$

where $\chi_{st,tr}$ is the two by two matrix given in eq. (B15), $\mathcal{Z} = \{\{S\}_1, \{S\}_1, [S]_1, [S]_2, 1, 2\}$ is the index set of the representations that are not equivalent to the adjoint or trivial representations and $\chi_{r,l,[adj]}$ is a three by three matrix given by (through lemma 1)

$$\chi_{r,l} = \begin{pmatrix} f & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & f & 0 \\ \beta & \beta & \chi_{[adj]} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{(B50)}$$

where we have again used the fact that Λ is CPTP to set several of off-diagonal elements to zero. The non-zero diagonal factor β is defined as (again through lemma 1 and eq. (B48))

$$\beta = \frac{1}{d^2-1} \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \langle\langle \tau\sigma_0 | \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2} | \tau^{[adj]} \rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{d^2-1} \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \langle\langle \sigma_0\sigma_\tau | \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2} | \tau^{[adj]} \rangle\rangle, \quad \text{(B51)}$$

and $\chi_{[adj]}$ is the proportionality factor associated with $R_{[adj]}$. Plugging this into eq. (B5) and working out

we get the following expression for the variance:

$$\mathbb{V}_m^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \Bigg[\chi_{tr}^{m-j} \frac{\|\alpha\|_2^2}{d^2-1} \langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2} | \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \tau\tau \rangle\!\rangle \langle\!\langle \sigma_0\sigma_0 | \rho^{\otimes 2} \rangle\!\rangle \tag{B52}$$

$$+ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Z}} \chi_i^{m-j} f^{2(j-1)} (\chi_i - f^2) \langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2} | P_i | \rho^{\otimes 2} \rangle\!\rangle \tag{B53}$$

$$+ \chi_{[adj]}^{m-j} f^{2(j-1)} (\chi_{[adj]} - f^2) \langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2} | P_{[adj]} | \rho^{\otimes 2} \rangle\!\rangle \tag{B54}$$

$$+ 2\beta \chi_{[adj]}^{m-j} f^{j-1} \langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2} | \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} |\sigma_0\tau\rangle\!\rangle \langle\!\langle \tau^{[adj]} | \rho^{\otimes 2} \rangle\!\rangle \Bigg]. \tag{B55}$$

It now remains to bound each of the four above terms. We begin by upper bounding eq. (B55) by upper bounding the proportionality factor β. We do this in lemma 8, yielding

$$\beta \leq 2\sqrt{d} \frac{\sqrt{d^2-4}}{d^2-1} \|\alpha\|_2 . \tag{lemma 8}$$

We can now use this and lemma 3 to bound eq. (B55) by the infidelity r:

$$2\beta \sum_{j=1}^{m} \chi_{[adj]}^{m-j} f^{j-1} \langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2} | \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} |\sigma_0\tau\rangle\!\rangle \langle\!\langle \tau^{[adj]} | \rho^{\otimes 2} \rangle\!\rangle \leq \frac{dr}{d-1} \left(\sum_{i=j}^{m} \chi_{[adj]}^{m-j} f^{j-1} \right) \hat{\eta} \leq \frac{d\hat{\eta}}{d-1} \frac{1-f^m}{1-f} r \tag{B56}$$

where we used $\chi_{[adj]} \leq 1$ and with $\hat{\eta}$ a function purely of Q, ρ of the form

$$\hat{\eta} = \frac{8\sqrt{2}\sqrt{d^2-4}}{d-1} \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \langle\!\langle \sigma_0\tau | \rho^{\otimes 2} \rangle\!\rangle \langle\!\langle \tau^{[adj]} | Q^{\otimes 2} \rangle\!\rangle = \frac{8\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{d}(d-1)} \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \rho_\tau \sum_{(\tau_1,\tau_2) \in C_\tau} Q_{\tau_1} Q_{\tau_2} \tag{B57}$$

where $\rho_\tau = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho\tau)$ is the generalized Bloch vector component of ρ, and the same for Q and C_τ is defined under eq. (B48). Next we can, as in eq. (B36), bound eq. (B52) using lemma 3 yielding

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} \chi_{tr}^{m-j} \frac{\|\alpha\|_2^2}{d^2-1} \langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2} | \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \tau\tau \rangle\!\rangle \langle\!\langle \sigma_0\sigma_0 | \rho^{\otimes 2} \rangle\!\rangle \leq \frac{1-\chi^m}{1-\chi} \frac{d-1}{d+1} r^2, \tag{B58}$$

where we again used $\chi_{tr} = \chi$ (eq. (A14)). The final step is bounding the terms eqs. (B53) and (B54). In the case of ideal SPAM (theorem 1) we could use lemma 4 to bound these terms but in the non-ideal case this is no longer possible. Instead we will "expand around" the ideal case. We begin by defining the functions $h_i(Q,\rho)$ for every irreducible subrepresentation R_i with $i \in \hat{\mathcal{Z}} = \mathcal{Z} \cup \{[adj]\}$ such that the following holds true:

$$\langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2} | P_i | \rho^{\otimes 2} \rangle\!\rangle = \rho_\sigma^2 Q_\sigma^2 \langle\!\langle \sigma\sigma | P_i | \sigma\sigma \rangle\!\rangle + h_i(Q,\rho) \tag{B59}$$

Note that if ρ, Q are of the form eq. (B1) then all h_i are zero. Filling in this expansion into eqs. (B53) and (B54) we get

$$\sum_{i \in \hat{\mathcal{Z}}} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \chi_i^{m-j} f^{2(j-1)} (\chi_i - f^2) \langle\!\langle Q|^{\otimes 2} P_i | \rho^{\otimes 2} \rangle\!\rangle = \sum_{i \in \hat{\mathcal{Z}}} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \chi_i^{m-j} f^{2(j-1)} (\chi_i - f^2) \rho_\sigma^2 Q_\sigma^2 \langle\!\langle \sigma\sigma | P_i | \sigma\sigma \rangle\!\rangle \tag{B60}$$

$$+ \sum_{i \in \hat{\mathcal{Z}}} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \chi_i^{m-j} f^{2(j-1)} (\chi_i - f^2) h_i(Q,\rho). \tag{B61}$$

We will proceed by bounding the first term in the RHS. Note that for $i \in \{[adj], [S]_1, [S]_2, \{S\}_1, \{S\}_2\}$ we have

$$\langle\!\langle \sigma\sigma | P_i | \sigma\sigma \rangle\!\rangle = 0. \tag{B62}$$

This means that we can use lemmas 4 and 6 to bound the first term as

$$\sum_{i\in\hat{\mathcal{Z}}}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\chi_i^{m-j}f^{2(j-1)}(\chi_i-f^2)\rho_\sigma^2Q_\sigma^2\langle\!\langle\sigma\sigma|P_i|\sigma\sigma\rangle\!\rangle \leq \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2}\right)\left(\frac{d^2-2}{(d-1)^2}\right)r^2. \tag{B63}$$

For the second term we use the fact that the χ_i lie in the spectrum of $T_{\mathcal{C}}(\Lambda^{\otimes 2})$ (this is easy to check). Since $T_{\mathcal{C}}(\Lambda^{\otimes 2})$ is a CPTP map we have by [15] the its spectral radius is less than one. This implies $\chi_i \leq 1$ for all $i \in \hat{\mathcal{Z}}$. Hence we can upper bound the second term in the RHS of eq. (B60) by

$$\sum_{i\in\hat{\mathcal{Z}}}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\chi_i^{m-j}f^{2(j-1)}(\chi_i-f^2)h_i(Q,\rho) \leq (1-f^2)\frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2}\sum_{i\in\hat{\mathcal{Z}}}h_i(Q,\rho) \leq \frac{dr}{d-1}\frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2}\sum_{i\in\hat{\mathcal{Z}}}h_i(Q,\rho) \tag{B64}$$

Now we use the definition of h_i to note that (as in [40]):

$$\sum_{i\in\hat{\mathcal{Z}}}h_i(Q,\rho)+\rho_\sigma^2Q_\sigma^2 = \mathrm{Tr}(Q\rho)^2-\frac{Q_{\mathbb{1}}^2}{d} = \rho_\sigma^2Q_\sigma^2-2\rho_\sigma Q_\sigma\eta+\eta^2, \tag{B65}$$

with,

$$\eta = \sum_{\substack{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\\ \tau\neq\sigma}}\rho_\tau Q_\tau, \tag{B66}$$

and hence, since $\rho_\sigma Q_\sigma, \eta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ we have

$$\sum_{i\in\hat{\mathcal{Z}}}h_i(Q,\rho) \leq \frac{3}{2}\eta, \tag{B67}$$

which gives a final bound on eqs. (B53) and (B54) of the form

$$\sum_{i\in\hat{\mathcal{Z}}}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\chi_i^{m-j}f^{2j}(\chi_i-f^2)\langle\!\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|P_i|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\!\rangle \leq \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2}\right)\left(\frac{d^2-2}{(d-1)^2}\right)r^2+\frac{d}{d-1}\frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2}\eta r. \tag{B68}$$

Combining the bounds on eqs. (B52) to (B55) we arrive at the final bound on the variance given by

$$\mathbb{V}_m^2 \leq 2\left(\frac{1-\chi^m}{1-\chi}\right)\frac{d+1}{d-1}r^2+\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2}\right)\left(\frac{d^2-2}{(d-1)^2}\right)r^2+\frac{d}{d-1}\frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2}\eta r+\frac{\sqrt{2}d}{d-1}\frac{1-f^m}{1-f}\hat{\eta}r, \tag{B69}$$

which is the bound we set out to find.

■

Optimality of variance bound

We also have the following theorem where we prove that for specific input states ρ and output POVM Q we achieve r linear scaling for randomized benchmarking using *any* 2-design. This means the result stated in theorem 2 is optimal in some sense.

Theorem 3. *Let Λ be a* unitary *quantum channel with infidelity r, take an input state ρ and an output POVM Q. Let also $U(d)$ be the unitary group of dimension d. Also let G be an arbitrary 2-design (see eq.* (A19) *for the definition of a 2-design). The variance of a randomized benchmarking procedure with sequence length m, using the 2-design G, written as $\mathbb{V}_m(G)$, maximized over the input state ρ and the output POVM Q, now scales* ***at least linearly*** *in infidelity r, i.e.*

$$\max_{\rho,Q}\mathbb{V}_m^2(G) \approx r. \tag{B70}$$

We will make use of the technique of symmetrization to prove this theorem. As discussed in the main text, symmetrizing an RB procedure consists of applying random gates R from a symmetrization group $\mathcal{R}$ to the input ρ and the output POVM Q before and after the randomized benchmarking procedure. In the following we will consider the case of symmetrization over the full unitary group, i.e. $\mathcal{R} = U(d)$. As we saw in eq. (51) in the main text, the variance of RB maximized over all possible input states ρ and output POVM elements Q does not increase when we perform symmetrization over the full unitary group $U(d)$, i.e.

$$\max_{\rho,Q} \mathbb{V}^2_{m,U(d)}(G) \leq \max_{\rho,Q} \mathbb{V}^2_m(G), \tag{B71}$$

where by $\mathbb{V}^2_{m,U(d)}(G)$ we denote the variance of RB using the 2-design G, symmetrized over the unitary group. Let us now analyze this symmetrized variance. Because the unitary group does not leave global phases invariant (Which the Clifford group does up to minus signs [1]) one has to be a little bit careful when writing down the variance. Note that for every operator A such that $\mathrm{Tr}(A) \in \mathbb{R}$ we can write $\mathrm{Tr}(A)^2 = \mathrm{Tr}(A)\,\mathrm{Tr}(A)^* = \mathrm{Tr}(A \otimes A^*)$ where $*$ denotes the complex conjugate. Hence we can write the variance (as in eq. (B4)) as

$$\mathbb{V}_{m,U(d)} = \langle\!\langle \int_{U(d)} d\mu UQU^\dagger \otimes (UQU^\dagger)^* | T_G(\mathbf{\Lambda} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}^*)^m - (T_G(\mathbf{\Lambda}) \otimes T_G(\mathbf{\Lambda})^*)^m | \int_{U(d)} d\mu U\rho U^\dagger \otimes (U\rho U^\dagger)^* \rangle\!\rangle, \tag{B72}$$

where the first twirl is now over the representation $\mathbf{g} \otimes \mathbf{g}^*$ with $g \in G$ and μ is the Haar measure over the unitary group [19]. Let us first isolate the symmetrization step. The representation theory of the unitary group is well known [19] and in particular it is known that the average over the representation $\mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{U}^*$ has two irreducible trivial sub-representations spanned by the vectors $|v_0\rangle\!\rangle := |\sigma_0\sigma_0\rangle\!\rangle$ and $|v_1\rangle\!\rangle := \frac{1}{d^2-1}\sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} |\tau\tau^*\rangle\!\rangle$ with $\sigma_0 = \mathbb{1}/\sqrt{d}$ the normalized identity matrix and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q$ the normalized non identity Pauli basis (eq. (A13)). By Schur's lemma (lemma 1) we now have that the symmetrized version of $\rho^{\otimes 2}$ becomes

$$\int_{U(d)} d\mu |U\rho U^\dagger \otimes (U\rho U^\dagger)^*\rangle\!\rangle = \rho_0 |\sigma_0\sigma_0\rangle\!\rangle + \rho_{tr} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d^2-1}} \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} |\tau\tau^*\rangle\!\rangle = \rho_0 \langle\!\langle v_0| + \rho_{tr} \langle\!\langle v_1|, \tag{B73}$$

with ρ_0, ρ_{tr} appropriate proportionality factors. Similarly we have that the symmetrized POVM element Q becomes

$$\int_{U(d)} d\mu \langle\!\langle U\rho U^\dagger \otimes (U\rho U^\dagger)^* | = Q_0 \langle\!\langle \sigma_0\sigma_0| + Q_{tr} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d^2-1}} \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \langle\!\langle \tau\tau^*| = Q_0 \langle\!\langle v_0| + Q_{tr} \langle\!\langle v_1|, \tag{B74}$$

with Q_0, Q_{tr} appropriate proportionality factors. Now because $|\rho\rangle\!\rangle$ and $|Q\rangle\!\rangle$ are only non-zero in the vector space $V = \mathrm{span}\{|v_0\rangle\!\rangle, |v_1\rangle\!\rangle\}$ we can restrict the difference operator in eq. (B72) to this subspace when calculating the variance. The next thing to note is that for all elements $g \in G$ we have that the action on V is trivial, i.e.

$$\mathbf{g} \otimes \mathbf{g}^* |v_a\rangle\!\rangle = |v_a\rangle\!\rangle, \tag{B75}$$

which holds simply because all $g \in G$ are unitary (and thus in $U(d)$) and we have already established that $U(d)$ acts trivially on the space V. In particular this means for the two copy G twirl that we have

$$T_G(\mathbf{\Lambda} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}^*)\Big|_V = \mathbf{\Lambda} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}^*\Big|_V = \begin{pmatrix} \langle\!\langle v_0|\mathbf{\Lambda} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}^*|v_1\rangle\!\rangle & \langle\!\langle v_0|\mathbf{\Lambda} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}^*|v_0\rangle\!\rangle \\ \langle\!\langle v_1|\mathbf{\Lambda} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}^*|v_0\rangle\!\rangle & \langle\!\langle v_1|\mathbf{\Lambda} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}^*|v_1\rangle\!\rangle \end{pmatrix}. \tag{B76}$$

Let us now calculate these components using the fact that the channel Λ is unitary, i.e.

$$\Lambda(X) = \hat{U} X \hat{U}^\dagger \qquad \forall X \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}), \tag{B77}$$

for some fixed unitary $\hat{U} \in U(d)$ [7]. Because for any unitary $\hat{U}$ the operator $\hat{\mathbf{U}} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{U}}^* = \mathbf{\Lambda} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}^*$ acts trivially on the vectors $|v_0\rangle\!\rangle, |v_1\rangle\!\rangle$ subspace we have that

$$\langle\!\langle v_a|\mathbf{\Lambda} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}^*|v_b\rangle\!\rangle = \langle\!\langle v_a|v_b\rangle\!\rangle = \delta_{ab} \qquad a, b \in \{0, 1\}. \tag{B78}$$

Hence we have that

$$T_G(\mathbf{\Lambda} \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}^*)\Big|_V = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{B79}$$

Now remembering from *eq.* (24) that the twirl $T_G(\Lambda)$ is a depolarizing channel with parameter $f = 1 - \frac{dr}{d-1}$ with r the average infidelity of the channel Λ we have that the restriction to the space V becomes

$$T_G(\mathbf{\Lambda}) \otimes T_G(\mathbf{\Lambda})\Big|_V = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & f^2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{B80}$$

Plugging all of this back into the expression for the symmetrized variance eq. (B72) we get

$$\mathbb{V}^2_{m,U(d)} = Q_{tr}\rho_{tr}(1 - f^2 m). \tag{B81}$$

From the symmetrization argument we know that the maximal variance must be at least as large as the above expression and hence we get

$$\max_{\rho,Q} \mathbb{V}^2_m(G) \geq \max_{\rho,Q} Q_{tr}\rho_{tr}(1 - f^2 m) \approx 1 - (1 - \frac{dr}{d-1})^2 m \approx r, \tag{B82}$$

which means that the maximal variance for any 2-design G must scale at least linearly in the infidelity r.

Appendix C: Technical lemma's

Here we prove some extra technical lemma's used in the main proof.

Lemma 4. *Take ρ, Q as defined in eq.* (B1)*, i.e.*

$$\rho = \frac{\sigma_0}{\sqrt{d}} + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{d}} \tag{C1}$$

$$Q = \frac{\sqrt{d}\sigma_0}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{d}\sigma}{2}. \tag{C2}$$

Also take again $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q$ the set of normalized Pauli matrices excluding the identity (eq. (A13)*) and*

$$V_d = \text{span}\{|\tau\tau\rangle\rangle : \tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\}, \tag{C3}$$

to be the space carrying the diagonal representation R_d of the Clifford group $\mathcal{C}$. (see eq. (trivial)*). From [23] we have that V_d falls apart into three subspaces V_{tr}, V_1, V_2 which carry irreducible inequivalent representations R_{tr}, R_1, R_2 of the Clifford group $\mathcal{C}$. Taking P_i to be the projector on the space V_i for $i \in \{tr, 1, 2\}$ we can make the following bounds*

$$\langle\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|P_{tr}|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{d^2-1}, \tag{C4}$$

$$\langle\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|P_1|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{4}\frac{|P_1|}{d^2-1}, \tag{C5}$$

$$\langle\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|P_2|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{4}\frac{|P_2|}{d^2-1}. \tag{C6}$$

with $|P_i|$ the size of the support of P_i.

Proof. We begin by noting the for all P_i with $i \in \{tr, 1, 2\}$ we have that

$$\langle\langle Q^{\otimes 2}|P_i|\rho^{\otimes 2}\rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{4}(\langle\langle \sigma_0\sigma_0 + \sigma\sigma_0 + \sigma_0\sigma + \sigma\sigma|P_i|\sigma_0\sigma_0 + \sigma\sigma_0 + \sigma_0\sigma + \sigma\sigma\rangle\rangle) = \frac{1}{4}\langle\langle\sigma\sigma|P_i|\sigma\sigma\rangle\rangle. \tag{C7}$$

This can be easily checked by noting that $V_i \subset V_d$ for all $i \in \{tr, 1, 2\}$ and that $\langle\langle\sigma\sigma_0|\tau\tau\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle\sigma_0\sigma_0|\tau\tau\rangle\rangle = 0$ for all $\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q$. Now note that for any $g \in \mathcal{C}$ we have

$$\mathbf{g}^{\otimes 2}P_i = P_i\mathbf{g}^{\otimes 2}, \tag{C8}$$

by definition of an irreducible representation [17]. Now we use that the Clifford group acts transitively by conjugation on the non-identity Pauli matrices [1]. This means that for any Pauli matrix $\nu \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q$ we can find a Clifford operation $g_\nu \in \mathcal{C}$ which takes σ to ν up to a minus sign, i.e. $g_\nu\sigma g_\nu^\dagger = \pm\nu$, or in the Liouville picture

$$\mathbf{g}_\nu|\sigma\rangle\rangle = \pm|\nu\rangle\rangle. \tag{C9}$$

Now, by eq. (C8), we can make the following calculation

$$\langle\langle\sigma\sigma|P_i|\sigma\sigma\rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{|\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q|}\sum_{\nu\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q}\langle\langle\sigma\sigma|\mathbf{g}_\nu^{\otimes 2\dagger}P_i\mathbf{g}_\nu^{\otimes 2}|\sigma\sigma\rangle\rangle \tag{C10}$$

$$= \frac{1}{d^2-1}\sum_{\nu\in\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q}\langle\langle\nu\nu|P_i|\nu\nu\rangle\rangle \tag{C11}$$

$$= \frac{1}{d^2-1}\operatorname{Tr}_{V_d}(P_i) = \frac{|P_i|}{d^2-1}, \tag{C12}$$

where we used the definition of the trace over a vector space and also that for any projector P we have $\operatorname{Tr}(P) = |P|$. Feeding this back into eq. (C7) and noting that P_{tr} is of rank one we obtain the lemma statement. ■

Lemma 5. *Let Λ be a quantum channel and take $\mathcal{C}$ to be the multi-qubit Clifford group. We consider the representation $\mathbf{g}^{\otimes 2}$ of the Clifford group, which has by [23] a subrepresentation R_d (diagonal representation) carried by the space*

$$V_d = \operatorname{span}\{|\tau\tau\rangle\rangle : \tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\}, \tag{C13}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q$ is again the set of normalized non-identity Pauli matrices (eq. (A13)). This representation has three irreducible inequivalent subrepresentations R_{tr}, R_1, R_2 carried by spaces V_{tr}, V_1, V_2 such that $V_d = V_{tr} \oplus V_1 \oplus V_2$. We have for the proportionality factors $\chi_{tr}, \chi_1, \chi_2$ (defined as in lemma 1) of the twirl $T_{\mathcal{C}}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2})$ that

$$\chi_{tr} + |P_1|\chi_1 + |P_2|\chi_2 = \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q}\Lambda_{\tau\tau}^2. \tag{C14}$$

with $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau} = \langle\tau, \Lambda(\tau)\rangle$ and P_i the projector on the space V_i.

Proof. Because $V_d = V_{tr} \oplus V_1 \oplus V_2$ we have for the corresponding projectors that

$$P_d = \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q}|\tau\tau\rangle\rangle\langle\langle\tau\tau| = P_{tr} + P_1 + P_2. \tag{C15}$$

By definition (lemma 1) of the proportionality factors χ_i and lemma 4 we now have that

$$\chi_{tr} + |P_1|\chi_1 + |P_2|\chi_2 = \mathrm{Tr}(P_{tr}\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2}) + \frac{|P_1|}{|P_1|}\mathrm{Tr}(P_1\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2})\frac{|P_2|}{|P_2|}\mathrm{Tr}(P_2\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2}) \tag{C16}$$

$$= \mathrm{Tr}(P_d\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2}) \tag{C17}$$

$$= \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \langle\!\langle \tau\tau|\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2}|\tau\tau\rangle\!\rangle \tag{C18}$$

$$= \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \langle \tau, \Lambda(\tau)\rangle^2 \tag{C19}$$

$$= \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau}^2, \tag{C20}$$

which is the required statement. ■

Lemma 6. *Let $\Lambda : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be a quantum channel (CPTP map) with average infidelity r (and depolarizing parameter $f = 1 - \frac{dr}{d-1}$) and let $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ be the associated Liouville matrix in the basis of normalized Pauli matrices $\{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q, \sigma_0\}$ with $\sigma_0 = \mathbb{1}/\sqrt{d}$ (eq. (A13)). The quantity*

$$\frac{1}{d^2-1}\sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau}^2, \tag{C21}$$

where $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau} = \langle \tau, \Lambda(\tau)\rangle$ is a diagonal element of the Liouville representation of the channel Λ, has the following upper and lower bounds in terms of the infidelity r

$$1 - \frac{2d}{d-1}r + \frac{d^2}{(d-1)^2}r^2 \leq \frac{1}{d^2-1}\sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau}^2 \leq 1 - \frac{2d}{d-1}r + \frac{2(d+1)}{(d-1)}r^2. \tag{C22}$$

where d is again the dimension of the quantum system on which Λ acts.

Proof. We begin by noting that upper and lower bounds of the quantity eq. (C21) can be found by maximizing and minimizing respectively the following optimization

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau}\}_\tau} (\min) \quad & \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau}^2 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau} = (d^2-1)f \\ & \Lambda \text{ a CPTP map.} \end{aligned} \tag{C23}$$

Here we maximize (minimize) the quantity eq. (C21) over all possible CPTP maps which have depolarizing parameter f (eq. (A21)). Solving this optimization problem is not easy since it not clear how to express the CP condition in terms of the optimization parameters $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau}$. We will therefore relax this problem to an easier one which we can solve. We begin by noting that the optimization variables $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau}$ are invariant under the action of a Pauli channel, i.e. for all $G \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\mathcal{P}$ the Pauli group, we have that

$$(\mathbf{\Lambda_G \Lambda \Lambda_{G^\dagger}})_{\tau\tau} = \langle \tau, G\Lambda(G^\dagger\tau G)G^\dagger\rangle = \langle G^\dagger\tau G, \Lambda(G^\dagger\tau G)\rangle = [\mathrm{sgn}(\tau, G)]^2 \langle G^\dagger G\tau, \Lambda(G^\dagger G\tau)\rangle = \langle \tau, \Lambda(\tau)\rangle = \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau}, \tag{C24}$$

for all $\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q \cup \sigma_0$ where $\mathrm{sgn}(\tau, G)$ is defined as

$$\mathrm{sgn}(\tau, G) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if} \quad \{\tau, G\} = 0, \\ +1 & \text{if} \quad [G, \tau] = 0, \end{cases} \tag{C25}$$

which, since $\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q \cup \sigma_0$ is a normalized element of the Pauli group, is well defined because elements of the multi-qubit Pauli group can either commute ($[.,.]$) or anti-commute ($\{.,.\}$) with each other [20]. By

eq. (C24) and linearity we can now note that the optimization variables in the optimization eq. (C23) are invariant under twirling over the Pauli group $\mathcal{P}$, i.e.

$$T_P(\mathbf{\Lambda})_{\tau\tau} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}|}\sum_{G\in\mathcal{P}}\langle G^\dagger\tau G, \Lambda(G^\dagger\tau G)\rangle = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{P}|}\sum_{G\in\mathcal{P}}\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau}. \tag{C26}$$

Note also that the "twirl" operation, for any group, preserves complete positivity [44]. This means we can relax the optimization eq. (C23) to

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\{T_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Lambda})_{\tau\tau}\}_\tau}\ (\min)\quad & \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} T_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Lambda})^2_{\tau\tau} \\ \text{subject to}\quad & \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} T_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Lambda})_{\tau\tau} = (d^2-1)f \\ & T_\mathcal{P}(\Lambda) \text{ a CPTP map.} \end{aligned} \tag{C27}$$

Note that this is a relaxation of the previous optimization because while the twirl of a CP map will always be CP the opposite need no be true. Now we use the following result due to Holevo [25] which states that any CPTP map Λ, twirled over the Pauli group, is of the form

$$T_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Lambda})(X) = \sum_{G\in\mathcal{P}} p_G G X G^\dagger \qquad \forall X\in\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}), \tag{C28}$$

where $\{p_G\}_G$ is a probability distribution, i.e. $p_G \geq 0, \forall G\in\mathcal{P}$ and $\sum_{G\in\mathcal{P}} p_G = 1$. Let us now rewrite the optimization eq. (C27) in terms of this probability distribution. We begin by noting that since Λ is TP we have that $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\sigma_0\sigma_0} = 1$ and hence we can write the depolarizing constraint in eq. (C27) as

$$\sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} T_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Lambda})_{\tau\tau} = (d^2-1)f \iff \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\cup\sigma_0} T_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Lambda})_{\tau\tau} = (d^2-1)f + 1. \tag{C29}$$

Now, using the form of the Pauli-twirled channel, we can write the RHS of this equivalence as

$$\sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\cup\sigma_0} T_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Lambda})_{\tau\tau} = \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\cup\sigma_0}\sum_{G\in\mathcal{P}} p_G\langle\tau, G\tau G^\dagger\rangle \tag{C30}$$

$$= \sum_{G\in\mathcal{P}} p_G \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\cup\sigma_0} \mathrm{sgn}(\tau, G) \tag{C31}$$

$$= p_{\mathbb{1}} d^2, \tag{C32}$$

where in the last line we used that the identity Pauli element $\mathbb{1}$ commutes with all Pauli matrices $\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\cup\sigma_0$, whereas every non-identity Pauli G commutes with exactly of the elements of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\cup\sigma_0$ and anti-commutes with the other half. We also used that $|\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\cup\sigma_0| = d^2$. We can make a similar calculation for the objective of eq. (C27) which gives

$$\sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} T_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Lambda})^2_{\tau\tau} = \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\cup\sigma_0} T_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Lambda})^2_{\tau\tau} - 1 \tag{C33}$$

$$= (-1) + \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\cup\sigma_0}\left(\sum_{G\in\mathcal{P}} p_G\langle\tau, G\tau G^\dagger\rangle\right)^2 \tag{C34}$$

$$= (-1) + \sum_{G,\hat{G}\in\mathcal{P}} p_G p_{\hat{G}} \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\cup\sigma_0} \mathrm{sgn}(\tau, G)\mathrm{sgn}(\tau, \hat{G}^\dagger) \tag{C35}$$

$$= (-1) + \sum_{G\in\mathcal{P}} p_G^2 \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\cup\sigma_0} \mathrm{sgn}(\tau, GG^\dagger) + \sum_{\substack{G,\hat{G}\in\mathcal{P}\\ G\neq\hat{G}}} p_G p_{\hat{G}} \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q\cup\sigma_0} \mathrm{sgn}(\tau, G\hat{G}^\dagger) \tag{C36}$$

$$= (-1) + d^2\sum_{G\in\mathcal{P}} p_G^2, \tag{C37}$$

where we have used that $\mathrm{sgn}(\tau, G)\mathrm{sgn}(\tau, \hat{G}) = \mathrm{sgn}(\tau, G\hat{G})$, that $GG^\dagger = \mathbb{1}, \forall G \in \mathcal{P}$ and again that the Pauli identity $\mathbb{1}$ commutes with all elements of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q \cup \sigma_0$ while every non-identity Pauli $G\hat{G}^\dagger, G \neq G\hat{G}$ commutes with exactly half of the elements of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q \cup \sigma_0$ and anti-commutes with the other half. We have now rewritten the optimization eq. (C27) completely in terms of the probability distribution $\{p_G\}_G$. This becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\{p_G\}_G} \ (\min) \quad & (-1) + d^2 \sum_{G\in\mathcal{P}} p_G^2 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & d^2 p_{\mathbb{1}} = (d^2-1)f + 1 \\ & \sum_{G\in\mathcal{P}} p_G = 1 \\ & p_G \geq 0 \qquad G \in \mathcal{P}. \end{aligned} \tag{C38}$$

Noting that the element $p_{\mathbb{1}}$ is essentially fixed we can eliminate this element form the optimization and obtain an even simpler optimization

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\{p_G\}_G} \ (\min) \quad & (-1) + d^2 \sum_{G\in\mathcal{P}/\{\mathbb{1}\}} p_G^2 + d^2 \left(\frac{d^2-1}{d^2} f + \frac{1}{d^2}\right)^2 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{G\in\mathcal{P}/\{\mathbb{1}\}} p_G = 1 - \frac{d^2-1}{d^2} f - \frac{1}{d^2} \\ & p_G \geq 0 \qquad G \in \mathcal{P}/\{\mathbb{1}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{C39}$$

The above optimization is a well studied instance of a class of optimization problems called quadratic programs [6]. This problem has the minimum [6, Chapter 4, Section 4]:

$$p_{G,min} = \frac{1}{d^2-1}\left(1 - \frac{d^2-1}{d^2} f - \frac{1}{d^2}\right) \qquad \forall G \in \mathcal{P}/\{\mathbb{1}\}, \tag{C40}$$

and has d^2-1 degenerate maxima indexed by the non-identity Pauli elements $\tilde{G}$ of the form

$$p_{G,max} = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{d^2-1}{d^2} f - \frac{1}{d^2} & \text{if} \quad G = \tilde{G} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{C41}$$

This means we can lower bound the quantity eq. (C21), for any CPTP map Λ, by:

$$\frac{1}{d^2-1} \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau} \geq \frac{d^2}{d^2-1}\left(\frac{d^2-1}{d^2} f + \frac{1}{d^2}\right)^2 + \frac{d^2}{(d^2-1)^2}\left(1 - \frac{d^2-1}{d^2} f - \frac{1}{d^2}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{d^2-1}. \tag{C42}$$

By now using the relation $f = 1 - \frac{dr}{d-1}$ we can rewrite this lower bound in terms of the infidelity r. This process is straightforward but rather tedious so we will not write it down. At the end of the calculation we obtain

$$\frac{1}{d^2-1} \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau} \geq 1 - \frac{2dr}{d-1} + \frac{d^2 r^2}{(d-1)^2}. \tag{C43}$$

Similarly we can write for the upper bound

$$\frac{1}{d^2-1} \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau} \leq \frac{d^2}{d^2-1}\left(\frac{d^2-1}{d^2} f + \frac{1}{d^2}\right)^2 + \frac{d^2}{d^2-1}\left(1 - \frac{d^2-1}{d^2} f - \frac{1}{d^2}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{d^2-1}, \tag{C44}$$

which, by essentially the same tedious but straightforward calculation yields

$$\frac{1}{d^2-1} \sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\tau\tau} \leq 1 - 2\frac{dr}{d-1} + \frac{2(d+1)}{(d-1)} r^2, \tag{C45}$$

which completes the lemma.

■

Lemma 7. *Let $\Lambda : \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ be a qubit CPTP map with unitarity χ, non-unital vector α and infidelity r. We have the following inequality*

$$\frac{\|\alpha\|_2^2}{1-\chi} \leq \frac{3}{2}r. \tag{C46}$$

which leads to the an upper bound of the variance of an RB sequence of a single qubit of the form

$$\mathbb{V}_m^2 \leq \frac{7}{2}r + \eta. \tag{C47}$$

Proof. We begin by rewriting the unitarity χ and the non-unital vector α in a simpler way. Following [36] we can write the Liouville representation of any **qubit** CPTP map as

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = (1 \oplus U) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & w_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & w_2 & 0 \\ t & 0 & 0 & w_3 \end{pmatrix} (1 \oplus V) \tag{C48}$$

with $U, V \in SO(3)$ a pair of rotations of $\mathbb{R}^3$ and with $t, w_1, w_2, w_3 \in \mathbb{C}$ and complete positivity conditions

$$|t| + |w_3| \leq 1 \tag{C49}$$

$$(1 \pm w_i)^2 \geq (w_j \pm w_k)^2, \tag{C50}$$

for all combinations $i \neq j \neq k$. From the expression eq. (C48) we can write the non-unital vector of Λ as

$$\alpha = U(0, 0, t)^\dagger \tag{C51}$$

which can be verified by working out the matrix multiplication in eq. (C48). This means we have that the Euclidean norm of α is given by

$$\|\alpha\|_2^2 = \langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle = (0, 0, t)U^\dagger U(0, 0, t)^\dagger = t^2 \tag{C52}$$

because $U \in SO(3)$ is an isometry. Similarly, defining the matrix

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} w_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & w_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & w_3 \end{pmatrix} \tag{C53}$$

we have for the unitarity χ, using the definition in eq. (A14), that

$$\chi = \frac{1}{3} \operatorname{Tr}\left[(UWV)(UWV)^\dagger\right] \tag{C54}$$

$$= \frac{1}{3} \operatorname{Tr}\left[UU^\dagger V^\dagger V W W^\dagger\right] \tag{C55}$$

$$= \frac{1}{3} \operatorname{Tr}[WW^\dagger] \tag{C56}$$

$$= \frac{1}{3}(w_1^2 + w_2^2 + w_3^2). \tag{C57}$$

Using the positivity conditions we can then write

$$w_1^2 + w_2^2 = \frac{1}{2}\left((w_1 + w_2)^2 + (w_1 - w_2)^2\right) \tag{C58}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2}\left((1 + w_3)^2 + (1 - w_3)^2\right) \tag{C59}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2}\left(2 + 2w_3^2\right), \tag{C60}$$

$$\tag{C61}$$

and hence

$$1-\chi \geq \frac{1}{3}\left(1+w_3^2+w_3^2\right) \tag{C62}$$

$$\geq 1-\frac{1}{3}(3-4|t|+|t|^2) \tag{C63}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{3}(|t|(4-2|t|)), \tag{C64}$$

and finally

$$\frac{\|\alpha\|_2^2}{1-\chi} \leq \frac{3|t|}{4-2|t|} \leq \frac{\|\alpha\|_2}{4-2|t|} \leq \frac{3r}{2}, \tag{C65}$$

by lemma 3. We can use this equation to bound the prefactor in eq. (B36) in the qubit case together with the identity

$$\frac{1-f^{2m}}{1-f^2} \leq \frac{1}{1-f^2} \leq \frac{1}{4r(1-4r)} \leq \frac{1}{r}, \tag{C66}$$

for $r \leq 1/4$ leading to eq. (11).

■

Lemma 8. *Let Λ be a quantum channel with non-unital vector α. We define β as*

$$\beta = \frac{1}{d^2-1}\sum_{\tau\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \langle\!\langle \tau^{[adj]}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2}|\sigma_0\tau\rangle\!\rangle, \tag{C67}$$

with $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q$ the set of normalized non-identity Pauli matrices (eq. (A13)*) and $|\tau^{[adj]}\rangle\!\rangle$ defined as*

$$|\tau^{[adj]}\rangle\!\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d^2-4}}\sum_{\nu,\hat{\nu}\in C_\tau}(|\nu\hat{\nu}\rangle\!\rangle + |\hat{\nu}\nu\rangle\!\rangle), \tag{C68}$$

where $C_\tau = \{(\nu,\hat{\nu}) : \nu,\hat{\nu}\in\boldsymbol{\sigma}_q, [\nu,\tau]=0, \hat{\nu}=\sqrt{d}\nu\tau\}$ is the set of pairs of normalized commuting non-identity Pauli matrices such that their matrix product is proportional to τ. We have the following bound on β in terms of the non-unital vector α

$$\beta \leq 2\sqrt{d}\frac{\sqrt{d^2-4}}{d^2-1}\|\alpha\|_2 . \tag{C69}$$

Proof. Note first that $|C_\tau| = \frac{d^2-4}{2}, \forall \tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q$ [23]. The proof now proceeds by direct calculation. We have

$$\beta = \frac{1}{d^2-1}\sum_{\tau} \langle\langle \tau^{[adj]} | \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\otimes 2} | \sigma_0 \tau \rangle\rangle \tag{C70}$$

$$= \frac{1}{d^2-1}\frac{1}{\sqrt{d^2-4}} \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \sum_{(\nu,\hat{\nu}) \in C_\tau} \langle \nu, \Lambda(\sigma_0)\rangle \langle \tau, \Lambda(\hat{\nu})\rangle + \langle \hat{\nu}, \Lambda(\sigma_0)\rangle \langle \tau, \Lambda(\nu)\rangle \tag{C71}$$

$$= \frac{1}{d^2-1}\frac{1}{\sqrt{d^2-4}} \sum_{\nu} \sum_{\substack{\tau \\ [\tau,\nu]=0}} \alpha_\nu \langle \tau, \Lambda(\sqrt{d}\nu\tau)\rangle + \alpha_{(\sqrt{d}\nu\tau)} \langle \tau, \Lambda(\nu)\rangle \tag{C72}$$

$$= \frac{1}{d^2-1}\frac{1}{\sqrt{d^2-4}} \sum_{\tau \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}_q \\ [\tau,\nu]=0}} \alpha_\nu + \alpha_{(\sqrt{d}\nu\tau)} \tag{C73}$$

$$\leq 2\frac{\sqrt{d^2-4}}{d^2-1} \sum_{\nu} \alpha_\nu \tag{C74}$$

$$\leq 2\frac{\sqrt{d^2-4}}{d^2-1} \left\|\alpha\right\|_1 \tag{C75}$$

$$\leq 2\sqrt{d}\frac{\sqrt{d^2-4}}{d^2-1} \left\|\alpha\right\|_2, \tag{C76}$$

where $\alpha_\nu = \langle \tau, \Lambda(\sigma_0)\rangle$ is an element of the non-unital vector (eq. (36)) and $\|\alpha\|$ are the vector 1-and 2-norms and we used the definition of C_τ and the following chain of inequalities valid for all normalized Pauli matrices ν, τ and CPTP maps Λ:

$$\langle \tau, \Lambda(\nu)\rangle \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \langle \sqrt{d}\tau, \Lambda(\nu)\rangle \tag{C77}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \left\|\Lambda(\nu)\right\|_1 \tag{C78}$$

$$\leq \frac{\left\|\Lambda(\nu)\right\|_1}{\left\|\tau\right\|_1}, \tag{C79}$$

$$\leq 1, \tag{C80}$$

and that $\left\|\tau\right\|_1 = \sqrt{d}$ (the norm being the Schatten 1-norm [44]) for all normalized Pauli's and [35] for the last inequality. ■